

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXXIII, 4.

WHOLE NO. 132.

## I.—DERIVATIVES OF THE ROOT STHA IN COMPOSITION.

### I.

#### GENERALITIES.

1. It is well known that a suffix has often arisen from the extension of a posterius of composition, but I think I have never seen the deduction made that when the prius of derivation is either an adverb or a noun in case form there is a strong probability that the apparent suffix must once have had enough verbal individuality to be regarded as a posterius of composition. By way of illustration let me use an example that I propose to reserve for expansion in a subsequent study, viz.: the example supplied by the Greek words *έαρι-νός*, *περνσι-νός*, *έωθι-νός*, *ήμερι-νός*, *νυκτερι-νός* (see Brugmann, Gr. Gr'. § 190, 2). In view of the obvious locative (or adverb) in the prius of these words I cannot doubt that *-νός*<sup>1</sup> has an explicit meaning, the meaning to wit of Lat. *-cola* 'habitans' or of its Sanskrit equivalent *-cara-s* 'migrans' (cf. Lat. *caeli-cola* with Skr. *divi-cara-s*, both used of the 'sky-goers' who developed into the 'sky-dwellers'). The same double reference to the place of wandering as the habitat is found in Eng. *dwells* 'habitat': OEng. *dwelian* 'errare, morari, habitare'.

2. But how reluctant scholars are to admit composition rather than suffixation. Brugmann, e. g., not only indicates his general

<sup>1</sup> It belongs with the Skr. root *ni-* 'ducere', with the sense of Germ. 'ziehend' ('migrans'), or with Skr. *nas-* ('ein-) heimsen'.

hostility to explanation by composition (v. Gr<sup>2</sup>. II. 1, p. 7), but goes specifically out of his way (l. c. p. 405 fn.) to challenge the genuineness of *-iros* 'way' in *ἀμαξ-ιρός* 'wagon-way' *ἀτραπ-ιρός* 'cross-way', in favor of some undefinable suffixal *-ito*—as though some malicious sprite of popular etymology had worked a bastardy with *λέναι*, whereas every feature of *-iros* in these compounds suggests its legitimate descent from *λέναι*. It is well for us to remember that the notandum in a popular etymology may be as apt and correct as in a legitimate etymology, in which case a charge of illegitimacy is quite unwarranted unless abnormal phonetics or positive facts of word-history can be brought forward to demonstrate the illegitimacy.

3. But a notable suggestion and admission of composition instead of suffixation has been made not so long ago. I refer to the analysis of *πεζός* as *\*ped-yo-s* 'pede iens', suggested by Schulze and admitted by Brugmann, though not distinctly accepted by Walde<sup>3</sup> (s. v. *acupedius*). But the applicability of this analysis to Lat. *acupedius* (cf. also *bipedius*) and, mut. mut., to *κυλλο-ποδίων* 'on-lame-foot-going' and *ιθυ-πτίων* 'in-straight-flight-going' (v. Fay, AJPh. 31, 426)—wherein *-ποδί-* and *-πτί-* are locatives followed by a confix *-iyen-* 'going'—seems to me not merely to warrant the acceptance but peremptorily to exclude the rejection of Schulze's analysis. The challenge made upon our belief by *ped-yo-s* 'pede iens' is direct. It is simply impossible not to believe it, for the reason that it is transparent, obvious—and for no other reason in the world. Equally direct, if not so strong, a challenge is made upon us by *ἐμ-μήνιος* 'in einem monat verlaufend' and by Lith. *ižažb-is* 'in die ecke laufend', wherein Brugmann's unpurposed definitions with 'laufend' (Gr<sup>2</sup>. II. 1, § 61, 1) fairly suggest the connection of the suffix with the root of 'ire', and *ἐμ-μήνι-* can hardly be aught but the coalescence of *ἐν μηνί*. Similarly, perhaps, Lat. *egregius* adumbrates a vanished *\*in gregi-yo-s*.

4. In the present study I propose chiefly to deal with compounds in which some derivative of the root of the *stāre*-sept plays the part of a posterius of composition (see also Fraenkel, KZ. 42, 241). Shall we write that root as *sthā-* or as *sthāy-* or decline the issue by writing *sthā-y-* (see Bezzenger in KZ. 41, 104<sup>2</sup>)? After all, the debate cannot be brought to an issue. Still, for convenience of rubrication in this study, I shall speak of the root as *sthāy-*, as that gives the clearest account of the use of

*-stīno-s* as a confix (§ 27), cf. Skr. *pra-sthāy-in-* 'proficisciens', *sākām-prasthāyīya-*, the passive *sthīyātē*, and especially Lith. *stainia* 'stall' (§ 14), Lat. *postī-cum* (§ 16); furnishes the simplest rubrication for *-sthī-s*, as compared with Brugmann's *-sth-i-s* or Bartholomae's *-sth(ə)ti-s*; and vindicates Varro's derivation of *stīva* from *stare*, to wit: *regula quae stat, stīva ab stando* (l. l. 5, 135). The *v* of *stīv-a* can hardly be unconnected with the *v* of Skr. *sthāva-rīs* 'stans, firmus, solidus' and the *i* will be a form of *ay* : *āy* (cf. my derivation of Skr. *nīvi-s* 'vestitus' from [s]nāi-w-: *snāyati* 'vestit' in AJPh. 25, 373, 379).

5. So I write the root as *sthāy-*, but unless we make entirely unreasonable semantic exclusions we must also acknowledge the form *stāy-* in Skr. *stī-ma-s* 'stagnant' (AV. 11, 8, 34, of the waters), *stīy-ā* 'stehendes wasser': Av. *armaē-śtā* 'still-stehend, stagnirend' (of water), cf. *στά-δ-a* (fem. sg.) used of 'stagnant' water. This evidence demands that we write the root as *st(h)ā(y)-* 'to stand; be firm, congeal' and derive therefrom the sept to which Skr. *styāyate*, Greek *στέαπ* belong (v. the lexica).<sup>1</sup> In *τī-φος* (es-stem) for *\*στίφος* we have the proper conditions for deaspiration as well as for loss of *σ-* (by dissimilation).

6. The variation between *t* and *th* in this root<sup>2</sup> must on the whole be regarded as proethnic, though most of the recorded evidence can be so disposed of as to avoid an issue. Thus *σθ-ένος* 'might' (=staying power), modelled on *μένος* 'might' (also=staying power), is in conflict with Hesychian *ἀστηνεῖ ἀδυνατεῖ, ἀστῆνες ταλαιπωροι, δυστυχεῖς* (cf. *ἀτήνεις μοχθεῖν*), but an appeal again for the *θ* may be and has been made (cf. Siebs, KZ. 37, 281) to *εὐθενεῖν* 'vigere'<sup>3</sup>, and though the obvious definition of *πρό-σθίος* is 'prae-stans' and of *δπί-σθίος* 'a tergo-stans' (cf. Aeolic and Doric *δπισθα*), one may choose to divide as *πρόσθ* + *ιο-* and decline to account for *-σθ-* at all, though *πρό-σθε(v)* be left ever so riddlesome. In Sanskrit, if we contrast *pari-ṣṭhā-* 'umstehend, hemmend; fem. hinderniss' with *pari-ṣṭi-* 'hinderniss' (for the sense cf. Lat. *obstat* 'hinders'), since one would now hardly rely on Grassmann and derive *pariṣṭi-* from *pari* +

<sup>1</sup> A diphthongal form of root is shown by extensions with determinatives as e. g. Lith. *staī-bis* 'frost', *στι-φ-ρός* 'solid', Skr. *stī-bh-i-s* 'bunch, clump'.

<sup>2</sup> See also Brugmann, Gr.<sup>2</sup> I. § 703, anm.

<sup>3</sup> Others compare Skr. *dhdna-m* 'Kaufpreis'—with no great semantic probability.

*-sti-* (: the root *as* 'esse')—here cf. the definitions of the later and earlier Petersburg lexica—it would be open to him to declare that *t* of *pari-ṣṭi* has lost its aspiration owing to the counter terms *abhiṣṭi-* 'hülse' *abhiṣṭi-* 'helfer, beistand' (see § 78). Here belong *ni-ṣṭhā-* (pada-text *niḥ-ṣṭhā-*) 'extans' (trans.=adducens), but without aspiration *ni-ṣṭya-s<sup>1</sup>* 'auswärtig, fremd' (cf. Lat. *hostis* 'extans' in § 86); *ni-ṣṭhā* (sem. subst.) is 'ende, grenzpunkt' (again='extans').

7. The explanation by dissimilation of aspirates may, in the case of this root, be appealed to as the real cause of a proethnic variation between *sth* and *st*. Its reduplicated present and compounds like *abhi-ṣṭi-s* furnished the proper recurring conditions and the deaspiration of the surd aspirates may have begun prior to the deaspiration of the sonant aspirates, and already in the proethnic time. Thus from a reduplicated present stem like *\*sthī-st(h)ā-* a root-form *-stā* might have grown up, as a "root" *ṣṭhā-* grew up in the Indic dialects (cf. Wackernagel, ai. Gram. I. 236); and what we are pleased to regard now as the derivatives *sta-tus*, *στάσις*, Skr. *sthī-ti-s* | *sthī-ti-s* may all have come from reduplicated start-forms *\*sthə-(s)t(h)ū-s* (cf. Skr. *ta-sthu-s* 'stans, perstans') *\*sthə(s)t(h)i-s* (cf. the Latin perfect *steti*), whence by irradiation to the *βάσις* and other like groups the suffix *-ti-(-tu-)*.<sup>2</sup>

8. The fact of proethnic conflict between *sth* and *st* in members of the *sthā-* sept scarcely admits of being brought to an issue for an etymological reason. I allude to the words like Avestan *sti-* 'Wesen' and Skr. *stī-* 'cliens' (§ 78), united by Bartholomae in his lexicon, col. 1593, and compared with *caelestis* 'qui est in caelo'. In BB. 22, 122 Prellwitz resolved *caelestis* into *caelei-estis*, but he is now (see his lexicon s. v. *δύστηνος*) of a better mind (§ 84).

9. No, a definitive issue, whether semantic or morphological, can scarcely be raised here. The truth is that the root *sthā* shows in its historical representations so many convergences of meaning toward the root *es* that we must use our common sense and admit a great deal of neutral ground between 'stare' and 'esse',

<sup>1</sup> So *āvi[s]-ṣṭya-s* 'offenkundig, offenbar', may be regarded as for *\*āviṣṭya-s* 'offen-stehend'. See further § 23.

<sup>2</sup> A posterior *sthī-* or *sthu-* would mean 'state' (cf. on *-stati-*, *-stuti-* AJPh. 31, 417<sup>1</sup>) and it is quite impossible to decide between *vir-[s]thu-s* (see §§ 12, 17) 'man's estate' and *vir-tu-s* 'man's power' (see on *-tu-* 'power' IF. 29, 414<sup>2</sup>) on merely phonetic grounds

belonging equally to both. It is not merely that the root of 'stare' has furnished a copula in Old Irish as in Prakrit and in the Romance tongues, but in early Sanskrit, if not in the Vedas, the root *sthā* expressed ideas that one now renders into Latin by 'exstare, adesse, se habere, esse; alicuius (alicui) esse'. In Greek, also, *ἴστημι* is "often merely a stronger form of *εἰμι* 'to be there, to be,' like Ital. *stare*" (v. Liddell and Scott, s. v. B. 1, 5). The same convergence of sense toward 'esse' is shown by Latin *exstat, existit*. Even for Av. *sti-* 'Wesen' we satisfy all the legitimate demands of definition with our two English words 'existence' and 'substance', which come from 'stare', not from 'esse', and the infinitive *stōi/stē* is as well defined by 'stare' as by 'esse'. For an Indo-Europeanist *sto ergo sum* is a perfectly legitimate enthymeme.

10. The existence of an Indo-European abstract *sti-* or *estī-* seems to be open to challenge, not only for Avestan—and for Latin (see Walde<sup>2</sup>, s. v. *pestis*)—but also for Sanskrit. Deferring for a time the consideration of *sti-* 'cliens' (see § 78), it is questionable if *sv-astī-s* 'well-being' may be so considered. In view of such English nouns as *habitat, fiat, ipse-dixit*, it is a tenable position that *sv-astī-s* is a nominalization of the phrase *su asti* 'bene est', a word in the making, indeclinable in half of its uses in the Rig Veda.<sup>1</sup> In Greek we have *ἐστώ* 'substance' (ἀλλ' ἀνάγκα ἀτέραν τινὰ εἰμεν αἰτίαν τὰν κινάσοισαν τὰν ἐστώ τῶν πραγμάτων ἐπὶ τὰν μορφώ, Archytas cited by L. Meyer, Wtbch., I. p. 393), *εὐεστώ* 'tranquility, well-being' (Hdt., Aesch.) with the counter-term *κακεστώ* (Hesychius), *ἀειεστώ* 'eternal being' (Antiphon), *ἀπειστώ* 'absence' (Hdt.), and *συνειστώ* 'convivium' (Hdt. 6, 128). Skr. *sv-astī* will have been a statement assuming the realization of a wish, and *εὐ ἐστω[δ]* the imperative of benediction echoing the imperative of petition. The separation of this *εὐ ἐστω* out of the formula may be realized by a consideration of words like *ave* and *paternoster*, while in complete nominalization there is a

<sup>1</sup>This derivation has analogies in savage tongues. In Athabascan (see Hdbk. Am. Ind. Lang., p. 109) 'rain' is *nañya* 'it comes down', a 'creek' is *nilliñ* 'fluit', 'snow' is *nāndil* 'they come down', a 'bundle' is *willoi* 'vincitum est', while a 'belt' is *naxō-willoi* 'ei circumvinctum est.' A 'fire' is *Lenawilla* 'they have been laid together', a 'fishing-board' is *talkait* 'over the water it has been pushed'. These examples deserve the consideration of those who are trying to derive the IE. verb ending *-ti* from the abstract nouns in *-tis*, and show that the converse may rather be true.

resemblance to *rendezvous* or *revenez-y*. English *welfare* (*εὐεστά*, with the flexion and accent of the *ω* nouns) is not so different from *farewell* (quasi *εὐ ἔστω*), and *συνεστά* 'good cheer, entertainment; convivium' seems, in the light of Eng. *welcome*, Fr. *bienvenue*, a somewhat natural development of the formula of invitation *συνέστω* <'apud me> adsit'—cf. for the connotation the combination of *σύνειμι* with *φέρει ηδεσθον βίω* (Aristoph.), *τρυφερῷ βίῳ* (Menander). The philosophical term *ἔστα* 'substance, matter', perhaps did not arise in some cosmogony wherein *ἔστω* functioned as *fiat* (lux) in the Vulgate, but by discomposition from *εὐεστά κακεστά*.<sup>1</sup> [Eng. *lavabo* a striking formula-word.]

II. But these *-έστα* compounds are all liable to derivation from *ἴστημι*,<sup>2</sup> viz.: from the ptc. *έστως*. Thus *\*εὐεστώς* (substantivized neuter) would mean something like 'bene-stantia', cf. Skr. *tasthi-vāñ-s*—'stehend, unbeweglich, fest' (of the permanent and stationary as opposed to *jágat*, the movable and living). With this definition *ἀπέστω[σ]* cited by Hesychius in the perplexing accusative *ἀπέστοῦν*,<sup>3</sup> τὴν αἰώνιον οὐσίαν ἡ ἀδιότητα, entirely accords. Ionic *ἀπέστώ*, instead of *ἀφεστώ*, would be entirely normal, and would explain the development of *έστα* as a technical term by the Ionic philosophers. The sense of 'substance' as contradistinguished from 'form' (*μορφή*, see § 10) easily derives from that of 'the permanent' (*τὸ έστώς*). Similarly Skr. *svasti-s* may be for *\*sva-st(h)i-s* (on *sth* | *st* see §§ 5-6), cf. the later words *sva-stha-s* 'in ordnung seiend'<sup>4</sup>, *validus, laetus*, frequently read for *su-stha-s*

<sup>1</sup> Is it too much to guess that the vigorous newness of this *έστα* was what prompted the alteration of *μορφή* to *μορφώ* in Archytas, as cited above?

<sup>2</sup> Here we may note *Καλλιστώ* 'in beauty standing', cf. Byron's wonderful "She walks in beauty". Then *καλλι-* is, in this context, a locative: *καλλος* (see AJPh. 31, 411, § 36), less likely an abstract stem (see Fay, KZ. 45, 133; Fraenkel-Schulze, *ibid.*, 42, 124). A name like *καλλιστώ* serves admirably to illustrate the semantic development of the superlative asserted in AJPh. I. c. § 16 sq.; see also § 43. So Homeric *βίγ-ι-στος* = 'in rig(or)e stans', though in *rig-i-dus* (v. ll. cc.) *-i-* looks to be a stem, or at least is not of easy interpretation as a case-ending. In *οἰκτ-ι-στος* *-i-* if a locative is either heteroclitic to an *es*-stem *\*τὸ οἰκτος*, or to an *o*-stem (*δὲ οἰκτος*), cf. Homeric *ἄλκι*: *ἄλκη* (*ā*-stem), though the easy interpretation of *ἄλκι-μος* and *ἄλκι-φρων* is from a stem *ἄλκι-*.

<sup>3</sup> Can there have been a stem *\*έστ[σ]Fοῖς*. (cf. *έστός* varying with *έστως*), with gen. *\*έστFοῖς*, alternating with a stem *\*έστFώς*- gen. *\*έστFῶς*? Even so a pair of accusatives (masc. or fem.) *\*έστFων* and *\*έστFῶν* are hard to account for.

<sup>4</sup> In RV. *su-sthū-s*, properly defined by Grassmann as "in gutem Zustande befindlich."

(cf. Lat. *suus*=*proprius*), *svāsthya-m* 'wohlsein, behagen'. We might even treat *svasti-s* as *\*sva-st(h)i-s* 'proprii-status'. Conceptually opposite to *svāsthya-m* is Av. *ayō-sti-*, name of a sickness, quasi '*übel-stand*', while *δύστημα* 'in evil plight' is the opposite of Skr. *sva-stha-s* 'wohl auf' and bespeaks its antiquity. See § 83 for Latin *sospes*.

12. In connection with the treatment of the *-sthō*- compounds arises the question of the treatment of heavy and almost asyllabic consonant groups at the junction points of the compounds, and especially of (1) *-rsth-* and (2) *-ksth-*. As regards *-rsth-* the evidence seems to show that the reduction to *-rth-* was either general in the proethnic time or occurred severally in most, if not all, of the derived languages. Should we find *-rsth-* (whence subsequent *-sth-*<sup>1</sup>) the reintroduction or retention of *s* was due to a feeling for the signification of *-sthō-s-* 'stans' in the compound, cf. *παράσ παστάς παστός παπαστάς* as treated by Fraenkel, KZ. 42, 245 sq. For *-ksth-* much the same developments are to be reckoned with. The reduction to *-kth-* in forms like *ēkros* OHG. *sehto* was probably normal—though it may have occurred independently in several of the derived languages. Thus it was probably in the separate life of Sanskrit that the 3d sg. mid aor. *ābhakta* arose from *\*abaksta* (cf. Wackernagel, ai. Gram. I. § 233, c). The reintroduction or retention of the *s*, whence *-ksth-*, would be due to recomposition, that is to say that (*k*)*s(w)ek* <*s*> *thos* '6th' would owe its <*s*> to *\*tri-sthos* '3d', to say nothing of the discomposite (see §§ 36-37) (*k*)*s(w)eks* '6'. On the other hand, in Sanskrit *pañkli-s* 'five' (i. e. a pentad), which was isolated from the other ordinals, *ksth* was reduced to *kt(h)* (§33).<sup>2</sup> Cf. also *sak-(s)thi-* 'thigh', § 67.

<sup>1</sup> Bloomfield in AJPh. 12, 25, explained as pre-Aryan the loss of the *r* in *\*hā(r)sta-s* 'hand' (：*χεῖρ*) and *kt(r)sta-s* 'poeta': *kirti-s* 'laus', but see § 20.

<sup>2</sup> Consistency and rigidity are hard for all of us in our application of the phonetic laws. I have believed for years that the *k* and *ķ* series owed their differentiation to a parasitic palatalization conditioned on the neighboring sounds and still let myself try to infer a *gh* for *\*g̃hs* 'out' because of the *gh* of *hostis* (see § 86). But an unreflecting application of canons of rigidity is perhaps most deplorable precisely where we deal with heavy consonant groups massed at the junction point of stem with suffix or of prius with posterius. Neither the one nor the other of these weldings is quite unconscious, there is always opportunity for an analogy to arise here. As expressions of opinion note Verner in KZ. 23, 128: die sprache hielt auf einheit der flex-

[13. To account for the *ss* of Lat. *oss-is* (gen.), I have assumed (see PAOS. 31, 412<sup>2</sup>) that *-stl(h)-* (not *-stl-*) gave *ss* in Latin, while in Skr. *asthi-* it gave *-sth-*. As the word was a compound (§ 67) recombination must always be reckoned with. When recombination was not active then *-sth-* may have been the development still in the proethnic time. Perhaps a trace of conflict between normal *ss* and recomposite *st* is found in Lat. *pussula* | *pustula* 'little blister', wherein we may recognize *\*phut-* (see Prellwitz<sup>2</sup>, s. v. φῦσα) + *sth(o)la* as in *fistula* (§ 58)—though assimilation to *fistula* may account for the *st* form. As for *assula* | *astula*, it is clear from the passages in the Thesaurus that it was used of 'kindling' i. e. 'fire-sticks' or 'fire-brush'. If from the sept of Lat. *āter* (cf. especially OIr. *aith* 'fornax' in Stokes-Fick, 2, p. 9, and see Prellwitz, BB. 23, 71) a sense-unit ("root") *āt-* can be abstracted, a start-form *āt-sthola* 'fire twig' (see on *-sthola* § 49) were admissible. We are on somewhat firmer ground in deriving *asser*<sup>1</sup> 'rafter' from the preposition *ad* + *s̄ther*, cognate with στρωτήρ 'rafter, crossbeam'. The propriety of using a derivative of *st(h)er-* 'to cover' for a roof-timber may be defended either from a thatch or a tent-roof, and we may discern the propriety of the preverb *ad-* from a technical passage like Lex. par. fac. Put. 2, 1, <parietem> in *asserato* \* *asseribus abiegneis*, i. e. *ad-* describes the contact of the rafters with the 'stringers', cf. *ad-miniculum* 'prop'.—A compound of *st(h)er-* may also occur in *passer* 'sparrow'. The verb *construo* (in Tacitus the simplex), as a glance at the Thesaurus, 4, 547, 33, will show, was technically used with *nidum* ('nidificare'), and the sparrow seems to be architecturally gifted. When the house sparrow nests in trees (and not in a roof or thatch) its nest "is formed with a dome and composed, as in other cases, of a mass of hay, lined within with a profusion of feathers, to which access is gained by a hole in the side". Are we not therefore justified in explaining στρούθ-ός as 'strueim faciens'? Also note *nidum plumis consternunt* (Pliny) and στρούθια δ' ὑποβάλλει τρίχας καὶ ἔρια (Aristotle, H. A. 9, 13, 14) describing the

ionsendungen (cf. also Whitney, Skr. Gram.<sup>2</sup> § 555, a); Bartholomae, Gr. Ir. Phil., § 52, 3, die bedeutungsgleichen Suffixe werden auch lautlich mit einander ausgeglichen.

<sup>1</sup> The Plautine quip in Aul. 357 about using the *asseres* for fire-wood (ligna) may owe its point either to *assula* 'kindling' or to *assus* 'roasted'.

<sup>2</sup> Misdivided in the Thesaurus, s. v. *asser*.

lining of nests by birds. In view of the sparrow's domed nest with a hole at the side—and just such nests made of clusters of straw, and used as the abode of whole colonies of sparrows, I can see in numbers from my class-room window, securely pitched in the angle between a buttress and the tower-wall—I would explain *passer* as from *pad-*: Eng. *fat*, Germ. *fasz* 'cask' + *sther* 'struens'. Or the prius might also be connected with Germ. *fat-sch* 'coenum in vii', or, if written *pat-*, with the root of *περάννυμι*, with the vocalism of Lat. *patulus*. For the sense cf. *πέτ-ασος* 'hat' and *πατνώματα* *στεγάσματα οίκον*.]

## PLACE-WORDS.

14. That derivatives of *sthā-* should develop the sense of 'place' is what we might expect. We frequently have *-stho-* in the sense of 'stall,' e. g. in Skr. *go-ghā-s* 'cow-stall, standort', OHG. *ewi-st<sup>1</sup>* 'sheep-stall', ON. *nau-st* 'statio navalis'; Frankish *sunni-sta* 'swine-herd' (v. Bezzenger in KZ. 22, 278, and §§ 76-7); cf. Eng. *stud*, first of the 'stall' but then of the animals occupying the stalls; cf. also, even though it need not be original, OBulg. *stado* 'herd'. In these compounds the prius is of evanescent sense, whereas in a simplex like Lith. *stónē* (cf. *stai-nia* 'stable' with its precious testimony for diphthongal *sthāy-*) the sense is <'horse-> stall', cf. Alban. *stan* <'sheep-> stall'. We further have Skr. *sadhāstha-m* 'locus, sedes' (? from \**sadhas-sthā-*, tautological; cf. *sādhis-* 'ziel, ort, sitz') *prati-ghā* 'standort, wohnort', Lith. *dim-stis* 'haus-stand' (BB. 26, 167), *sthā-pātis* 'loci dominus (see § 82), *bhayā[s]-sthas* 'periculus locus' (see § 18), *pra-stha-s* 'table-land, plateau', *sām-sthē* (RV.) 'in loco ilico, statim'. Other adverbial formations are *a-sthā* 'ilico' (cf. Zubaty, KZ. 31, 7), wherein *a-* is probably reduced *en-* 'in',<sup>2</sup> though it might be *ad-* (: Latin *ad*), or even a negative (*asthā*= haud mora); *anu-ghā* | *anu-ghuyā* 'ilico', or perhaps 'succes-sim', cf. *anu-ghā-s* 'succedentes'. As in *anu-ghā-s*, the sense of quick motion is also found in Vedic *pra-sthāv-an-as* (Voc. plur.) qualifying *marutas* and rendered by 'celeres'. Further

<sup>1</sup> On Bezzenger's perfectly sound analysis of Goth. *avi-str* 'ovile' as schaf-lager see § 77.

<sup>2</sup> The alleged Skr. root *asth-* (see IF. 5, 388) is non-existent (see Lanman ap. Whitney's Atharva Veda, 13, 1, 5), but the sense of 'instare' suits the passages.

cf. *μετανάστης* (§ 86). [Add Homeric *κατ'* *ἄντη-στιν* as now explained by Schwyzer in *IF. Anz.* 30, 33.]

15. A further group of Sanskrit adverbs, hitherto misunderstood, and probably misunderstood very anciently by the Vedic diaskeuasts, corresponds with Latin *praestō(d)* 'prae (loco)'. These are *adhā[s]-st(h)āt* 'infra (loci)', *ava[s]-stāt* 'infra', *parā[s]-stāt* 'supra; porro', *purā[s]-stāt* 'ante', *upāri-stāt* 'deorsum'; *prāk-[s]tāt* (see § 12) 'von vorne', *āpāk-[s]tāt* 'von hinten.' Owing to the interplay of this type on the type of Skr. *ārāt* 'von ferne' and Lat. *suprād* 'over' Skr. *adharāt* 'infra' has been equipped with a doublet *adharāttāt*. Not but that we can justify the use of this enclitic *-tāt* on general principles, but the then adventitious *s* of *upāri-stāt* and the normal loss of aspiration in *adhā[s]-stāt* make strongly for the grouping of this adverbial type with Lat. *praestō[d]*.<sup>1</sup>

16. Lith. *dim-stis* 'house-stead', whence 'house', furnishes a good point of vantage for explaining Skr. *pastī(y)a-m* 'behausung, stall', *pa-stī(y)ā* 'wohnsitz, haus', named, I take it, from their sheltered and retired position. I assume a proethnic (*a*)*po-sthi-* 'apstans',<sup>2</sup> cf. *anóorātus* 'repository, store-house'. Here Lat. *po-stī-cum* 'back door, rear of house, back-house (privy)' belongs, and its *z* is a testimony to the root *sthāy-* (§ 4). I define *po-sti-s* by <'a foribus > apstans'<sup>1</sup>, certainly an adequate notandum for the door posts or jambs, though the original sense may have been that of a standing growth, a stalk (see §§ 47, 49)—which leaves, however, the *po-* much harder to account for.<sup>3</sup> A somewhat different notandum meets us in

<sup>1</sup> I do not follow Walde<sup>2</sup> in deriving the *l* of *praestolari* from this *d*, but rather equate the *l* with the *l* of Germ. *stuhl*. The word *praestolator* was then first used of those waiting in ante-chambers on stools (cf. § 19, fn.). For a start-form *sthōlo-/ā-*, admissible also for the *stool-sept*, we may plead the *ō* grade of *orō-muē* 'beam' (cf. Eng. *stud*, *studding* of upright beams), Aeolic *orōia* 'colonnade', Lith. *stūmī* 'stature'.

<sup>2</sup> In Latin *po(s)-ste* 'behind' the sense of the posterius has vanished.

<sup>3</sup> The possibility of *\*por-sthi-s* 'vorstehend' (so Brugmann Gr.<sup>2</sup> II. I, § 97, I, a) cannot be excluded; cf. AJPh. 32, 412, 14. Sommer's start-form *\*twostis*: Goth. *pwasti-pa* 'festigkeit' is not to be accepted, and the equation *tw-* = Latin *p-* has nothing to recommend it, though it has been accepted by both Walde and Stolz, as well as by Niedermann (IF. 26, 50); and Marstrander (ib. 20, 349) has built an etymology of *pernix* upon it. The criticism directed upon it by Charpentier (KZ. 43, 163) is entirely sound, and Ital. *pitita* from *pituita* (Niedermann, I. c. 52<sup>1</sup>) doubtless replaced *pitita* by a more normal re-

*rapa-orrás* which is the frequent definition of *postis* in the Latin glosses. It is needless to marshal here words like Doric *στάλα* 'prop, postis' or Lith. *statinis* 'vallum', but it is perhaps worth while to point out how Germ. *fest* may belong with *postis*, cf. e. g. Av. *stav-ra-* 'stark, fest' : Skr. *stambh-a-s* 'postis', and note Skr. pf. act. ptc., *tasthiváṁś-* 'stehend, unbeweglich, fest'. In general 'stans' 'apstans' as counter-terms to 'inclinans' were bound to acquire the sense of 'stiff, strong, fest'. The verb *to fast*, Goth. *fasten*, means '*abstare a*', revealing the concrete sense of *pastyā-m* as an 'off-standing' house, cf. *aṣva-pastyā-s* = equi-stabulum habens. In English, *fast-ness* still connotes a retired stronghold, usually in the mountains; while in *steadfast* and *standfast* we have tautological combinations.<sup>1</sup> In deference to the *a* of Arm. *hast* 'fest' we might write our start-form *på-stho-*.

17. Under circumstances already glimpsed above (§ 12) *-sthā-* yielded *-thā-*, e. g. in *ar-[s]tha-s* 'goal' (i. e. geh-steh-platz) and *tir-[s]tha-m* 'ford' (i. e. 'crossing place'), whereas in *kā-ghā* 'goal, curriculum', consciousness of the posterius dominated at the junction point, though the start-form for Aryan must be written *\*kars-sthā* and the doubling of the *s* may be the dominant factor in the phonetic process that obtained here.<sup>2</sup>

duplicative group. As for Lat. *paries*, which Charpentier finds unexplained, there is no reason to question *pari-et-* 'circum-iens', found as early as the Twelve Tables from which Varro (l. l. 5, 22) quotes '*ambitus parietis*'. On *-et-* : Skr. *dtati* 'errat' see Fay, Class. Quart. 3, 275. Gothic *rwasti-pa* is *fasti* (see § 16) affected in its initial by the group to which Eng. *th(w)ong* 'binding strap' belongs (cf. Fay, TAPA. 41, 47). For the connection of sense cf. our English proverb 'fast bind, fast find.'

<sup>1</sup> It is possible, but less likely, that this *pastyā-m* 'group' is to be connected with Lat. *positus*, *sub-postus*, etc., but the *i* of *postis* is best explained from *-sthi-* (see also Walde, s. v.).

<sup>2</sup> The primary suffix *-tha-* in Skr. may have started with *-(s)tha-*, but of the lists given by Macdonnell, Vedic gram., § 156, all nouns of rest and motion may owe their *-tha-* to irradiation from *dr-thā-s*, *tir-thd-m*, *kā-ghā*, and to words like *çay-d-[s]tha-m* 'lair', *āvasa-[s]thd-s* 'abode', *pra-vas-a-[s]tha-m* 'absence', the explanation by dissimilation might further apply. By phonetic loss of *s* in *-ksth-* (see § 12) we explain a word like *rek-[s]thd-m* 'hereditas' (i. e. 'reliqui stans'). Note the large group of words meaning 'song', etc.: e. g. *gā-thd-s*, *ud-gi-thd-s*, *gh-thā*, *nl-thd-m*, *rav-d-tha-s* 'roar', *tveg-d-[s]tha-s* 'furor', *prath-a-thd-m* and *çvas-d-[s]tha-s* 'snorting', *çap-d-[s]tha-s* 'curse', *stan-d-[s]tha-m* 'thunder', *stav-a-[s]thd-s* 'praise', *uk-[s]thd-m* 'saying', in several of which the loss of *s* by dissimila-

18. A special paragraph among the names of places is due to Lat. *infestus* 'periculus, nocens', which originated by coalescence, with thematic flexion, from the groups \**in fae[s]-stōd*, \**in faes-stom*, wherein \**fa[γ]es-sto-* is sound for sound identical with Skr. *bhaya[s]-stha-* 'periculus locus' (§ 14). The start-form of the prius was \**bhāyes-*, from the root *bhēy* 'ferire', cf. *pavor* 'fright', *pavēre* 'to be struck with fear': *pavit* 'strikes' (see Fay, AJPh. 26, 180). Skr. *bhayā-* 'fear' is from *bhāyā-*, but *bhiyās-* from *bhiyēs-*, *bhāyate*, with secondary accent, from \**bhāyētai* (cf. O Bulg. *boyq* 'timeo'). For the long diphthong cf. Skr. *bhi-* forms.<sup>1</sup> In Latin, *bhāyes-* gave *faēs-* (cf. *aēnus* from *ayes-nos*), whence in composition (cf. *profecto* from *pro factō*) *in-fē(s)-stus*. For a typical locution let us take Cicero, Planc. I (cited also by Nonius, 29, 11), *si huius salus ob eam causam esset infestior* (i. e. in periculoso loco = 'more endangered'). This shows how the sense of 'endangered' would have arisen. The sense of 'dangerous' might have arisen in a turn like *haec res mihi in \*festum* (cf. *in usum*) erit, or in an ablative turn like *res in periculo* [replace by \**festo*] *vertitur* (Plautus) 'the business becomes dangerous'.

#### POSTURE AND POSITION.

19. A large number of words with a posterius in *-stho-* 'stans' indicate posture or position,<sup>2</sup> to construe these terms rather widely, both as regards the abstract and the concrete, and to include words like Skr. *prati-ṣṭhi-s* 'wider-stand', *ava-sthā* 'abstand' Lith. *at-stū* 'procul' (i. e. 'apstans'), Lat. *praestō* (advb.) 'in readiness',—also Greek *ἴξαστις*<sup>3</sup> 'pile' i. e. outstanding threads of cloth,

tion was possible. For the relation of [s]thd-m in these words to the root *st(h)u- | stha-* see §20, and cf. on *στόμα* 'mouth', *στωμάλος* 'dicax' below (§ 66). For the propriety of the posterius *stho-* in *yū-thd m* 'herd', see on Frankish *sunni-sta* (§§ 14, 76). After the phonetic loss of *s* in *rik-[s]thd-m* and *rek-[s]thdm* merely formal analogy might have reduced *yū-[s]thdm* to its actual form.

<sup>1</sup> To this root belongs pre-Germ. *bai-no-m* 'bone', 'fractum, scissum', to wit, of the marrow bones as broken for food in neolithic times (§ 67).

<sup>2</sup> In PW.<sup>2</sup> Skr. *-stha-* is defined by 'stehend, sitzend, wohnend, weilend, befindlich; sich befindend; bei etwas seiend, beschäftigt mit, abliegend, ergeben. Cf. also § 81 fn. ('plenus').

<sup>3</sup> It is possible that *ἴξα-* is not from *ἴξ-av(a)-*, but that it belongs with *ἴξω* as *ἀνά* with *ἀνω*, *κατά* with *κάτω*. Thus *ἐφ-ἴξης* 'seriatim' (cf. Walde<sup>3</sup>, s. v. *series*) is from *ἐπ-* + \**εχσης* : \**εγχεις* 'binding, border, boundary', (cf. Skr. *sīmā*, etc.:

cf. Catullus 64, 318, *lanea* - - *morsa* - | *quae prius in levi fuerant extantia filo*), *λεπα(σ)-στη* 'limpet-shaped drinking cup', doubtless resembling the limpet in having a foot (base) to stand on.<sup>1</sup> Other names of pieces of furniture are *κι-στη* 'box, chest (*κι* : *κεῖται*, cf. *κοίτη* 'chest, bed') and Skr. *prō-ṣṭha-s* 'bench'<sup>2</sup> (*pro-* with a *u*-diphthong, strong grade to *u* in *πρύτανις*, cf. Thess. *προῦτος* 'primus' (?) and IE. '*prōw-yōn-*' in Walde<sup>3</sup>, s. v. *prōvincia*; see also Fay, AJPh. 31, 424 for the definition of *\*prow-yen-* as 'fore-going'). In Skr. *sv-āsa-ṣṭha-s* (=in bona sella sedens) note the change of posture, as compared, e. g. with *prati-ṣṭhā-s* 'fest-ste-hend'. We saw above (§ 6) that Skr. *ni-ṣṭhā-* 'adducens' (but cf. *puru-ni-ṣṭhā-s* 'vor vielen hervorragend') expressed causative motion, and motion is expressed—thanks to the preverbs—in *pra-ṣṭhā-na-m* 'profectio': Vedic *pra-ṣṭhā-van-* (voc. only), 'proficiscens; celer', *anu-ṣṭhā-* (plur. only) 'auf einander folgend' and *sam-ṣṭha-s* 'obviam iens'; also cf. *μερανάστης* 'landlouper, lustro' (§ 86). In *urdhva-ṣṭhā* (advb.) 'erecte' *-ṣṭhā-* is for *-ṣṭhā* (see § 17, fn.).

20. In the Avesta *aršta-* means 'erectus', and may be regarded as containing *or-* : Lat. *ortus* + *sthō-s*, unless we write a start-form *\*ordh(w)o-dh(?)tos*, whence with haplogonic shortenings Av. *aršta-* and Lat. *ōrsus*. Nearest of kin to Av. *an-aiiy-ā-sti-* 'nulum coitum habens' is Skr. *upa-ā* + *sthā* 'coitum habere (cum)'. Av. *paiti-ṣti-ś* (*paiti-a-sti-ś*, *paitiā-sti-ś*), used as a technical term

ap. Uhlenbeck), (?) *δχανον* 'band' (Fay, TAPA. 41, 50; 32), to which add *ἐχειται* in the sense of 'clings' (i. e. fixes oneself to), v. Liddell and Scott, s. v. C. 1-5. But this root *ēgh-* 'to bind' is thoroughly mixed with the root *segh-* in the flexion of *ἐχω*. A weak stage of *\*ēgħs* 'border' may be found in *σχ-ερός* 'row', but in Hesychius *ἀκτή, αἰγιαλός*. Did *σχ-ερός* first mean 'borderland' (-*ερός* : *ἐραče* 'earthward', see Fay, JAOS. 27, 402), with evanescence of 'land'? cf. *Σχερίην*, name of a sort of Ultima Thule among the Greek frontier islands.

<sup>1</sup> Or cf. Skr. *sthāld-m* 'shell' with the posterius *-στη*?

<sup>2</sup> The definition 'bench' may be admitted on the basis of Tait. Brah. II. 7, 17, 1, as cited by Ludwig in his Rig Veda, 5, p. 401, but in his translation (II. No. 908=R. V. vii, 55, 8) he rendered *proṣṭhe-ṣa-yās* (nom. plur. fem.) by "die im vorgebäude—liegen". In RV. 10, 60, 5 *ṛdha-proṣṭha-* is a proper name, and it would be curious indeed if it did not mean 'curru-praestantiam-habens'. With *-sthō-* as used in this group we should of course compare, for the meaning, Eng. *stool* and its kin (see also § 15, fn.).

<sup>3</sup> Do Attic *πρεμενής*, Ion. *πρημενής* 'benignus' contain *prēw*? Cf. Skr. *pra-mānas-*, same sense.

to describe the silent attention of a second person to another's Gātha recitation, reminds of Fr. *assister à* 'adesse alicui'. In the by-forms the *ā* may be a second preverb, but it may be due to association with some Iranian cognate of Skr. *abhy-ās-a-s* 'wiederholung, studium'. In *paityā-star-* 'studiosus' we have a doublet of *\*paityā-stā* after the fashion of *raθaē-śtar-* | *raθaē-śtā-* (§ 80). A posterius from *-sthō-s* is also found in *kī-stā-s* 'poet' (RV.) from *\*kir-stā-s*, whereof the prius is either cognate with *kīrī-s* 'poet' or contains *gīr-* 'song' affected by *kīrī-s* + *-st(h)o-s* with transitive sense, quasi *or(di)nans*. Here we may think of *στῆσαι χορόν* and of the choric *στάσιμον* (cf. Germ. *stollen*, Eng. *stanza*), and the question will arise whether Skr. *stu<sup>1</sup>* 'laudare' is not a specialized sense, allocated to a special grade-form, of the root *sthewā-* | *sthā-*, cf. the specialized sense of *orīw* 'erigo' (§ 64) and the Avestan prius *stož-* 'stiff'. Or the posterius of *kī-stā-s* may be connected in sense with the posterius of Av. *paityā-star-* 'studiosus' and mean something like 'sciens', cf. *ēriōrapai*, Germ. *verstehen*, Eng. *understand*. A start-form *\*kir-stra-s*, whence *\*kī-strās kī-stā-s* (see Wackernagel, ai. Gram., 1, 145 b., anm. for *stīr-* | *stī-*) might account perhaps for *-st-* (not *stī-*) in *kīstā-s*. Otherwise, the only assumption short of dialectic irregularity that I can adduce is the assumption of the reintroduction of *s* into *\*kir<st>ha-s* after its normal loss (see § 12).

21. The Avesta also has *vāñhārō-śta-* 'in vesti stans' (whence 'vestitur'), and from this starting point we realize how Lat. *onu(s)stus* may have meant something like 'in onere stans'; *fidusta* 'ea quae maxima fidei erant' (Festus, 64) and *confœdusti* 'foedere coniuncti' (ib. 28) would have meant 'in foedere stans'. This type does not really differ from the type of *scelestus* (§ 82) and with *scelestus* and *fidustus* before our eyes we see how *sublestus*, synonymous with the former and a counter-term to the latter, arose. Here it is possible to operate with the formal pair *levi-s* (adj.) : *\*leves-* 'lightness' :: Skr. *mahi-* 'magnus' : *māhas-* 'magnitudo', and derive our adjective from *\*sub-leve(s)stus*. Cf. Acc. 86, where *mulier funestā veste* = quae in veste funerali stat.

<sup>1</sup> The loss of aspiration in *st(h)u-* would be due to the impv. *stuḥi* (27 times in RV. against 29 other *stu-* presents) and to extensions by determinatives as in Skr. *stu-bh-* 'laudare'.

22. A posterius from the root *sthāy-* may also be recognized in the following :

(a) Lith. *pēscza-s* 'zu Fuss befindlich', which Brugmann (Gr<sup>2</sup>. I. § 912, 3) derives from \**pēd-tyo-s*, but \**pēd-sthyo-s* 'fuss-stehend' is a more intelligible start-form, being a counter-term to *pečos* 'pede iens' (§ 3), and parallel with *rathe-sthā-* 'chariot-fighter' (lit. '-stander'), describing another arm of the military service (see § 79).

23. (b). Greek *ἀνωιστί* (advb.), *ἀνώιστον* (n. adj.). These occur in Homer as follows :

(1) δ 92,      ἀδελφεὸν ἄλλος ἐπεφνεν

λάθρη, ἀνωιστί, δόλῳ οὐλομένης ἀλόχου.

(2) Φ 39, τῷ δ' ἄρ' ἀνώιστον κακὸν ηλυθε δίος' Αχιλλεύς.

In (1) the sequence after *λάθρη* warrants taking *ἀνωιστί* also as meaning in general 'furtim' and 'inapertum' (cf. in Silius Italicus *frau-dique inaperta senectus*), which is fairly adequate for *ἀνώιστον* in (2), while Germ. 'nicht offen-stehend' seems a perfectly appropriate starting point for a definition ending in 'unexpected'. Accordingly I regard *ἀνωιστί* as a negative compound closely akin to Skr. *āvi[s]-stya-* 'offen-stehend' (see § 6 fn.). The posterius *-στί* might be instrumental to \*-*sthi-s*, unless it is a locative with *ī*, or secondarily lengthened *ī* (cf. on the flexion of long-vowel monosyllables—not attested for the locative in RV, see Whitney, Gr<sup>2</sup>. § 351—Fraenkel in KZ. 42, 241 sq.). [Thus *ἀνωιστί* has no relation to *δίω* 'opīnor, ich glaube', which is from the preverb *o-* (recognized by some in *o-phinor*, see Brugmann, Gr<sup>2</sup>. II. 2, § 634) + the root of *εμαι* 'cupio'. So in Eng. *be-lieves*, Germ. *glaubt* we have compounds of preverbs + the root of Eng. *loves*, Germ. *liebt*. Similarly *opīnor* (87 times in Plautus against 3 other forms, cf. also *opīnio*) is from \**ob* + *wi-nor* (cf. Eng. 'I ween'), whence *op(φ)īnor* by the "law of mamilla" (see Fay in Class. Quart. 1, 25, pace 1, 26). The *o* of *ώσθην*, *ώσθη*, *ώσθείς* is secondary as in *γνωστός* (Homer), *ἐγνώσθην*. The complete synonymy of *δίω* *opīnor* and 'I ween', taken in connection with their parenthetic syntax, demands admission of their cognation.]

24. (c.) *μεγαλωστί*. The Homeric usage of this adverb is as follows : *κεῖτο* (*κεῖσθο*) *μέγας μεγαλωστί* (II, 776, ω 40) and *μ. μ. ταννωθείς* (Σ 26), and its sense is 'super magnam distantiam'. The prius has a lengthened *o* at the junction-point (cf. Brugmann, Gr<sup>2</sup>. I. § 544, 2; II, 1, 80) and the posterius is either a locative -*στ-ί*, or a neuter expressing extent of space, though it is not im-

possible that the posterius is *-sph(ə)ti-* 'spatium' in composition (: *σπι-δής* 'spatiosus', also from the root *sphē(y)-*).<sup>1</sup>

25. (d.) Lith. *auksztas* 'altus' suggests *augs-st(h)o-s* 'in-might-standing', whereas Lat. *augu(s)stus*, in view of Skr. *apnāh-stha-s* 'opum potens', suggests rather the definition 'vigoris potens', cf. § 82.

26. (e.) Lat. *manufē-stus* 'in manibus stans' has in its prius a lost locatival ending in *-fe*, cognate with the ending of *ibei ubei*. For the *e* cf. on *caelestis* (§ 84). The *f* may be due to misdivision as *manu-fēstus*. For the sense cf. (with esse, not stare) Sallust, Jug., 14, 4, *neque mihi in manu fuit* ('obvious, clear', so Lewis and Short) Jugurtha qualis foret; Cicero, Sest., 69, *quae cum res iam manibus teneretur* ("was certain, evident").<sup>2</sup>

27. (f) *ἀγχι-στίνος* 'prope stans', used in Homer of corpses lying piled together. I compare the posterius *-στίνος* directly with *stīmā-s* (AV. 11, 8, 34), used of 'stagnant' waters (see § 5). The *v* and the *m* are, under different accentual conditions, equally the product of *mn* in the participial start-form *\*stīmnas* 'stans': *st(h)āy-* (§ 4). I am not oblivious of Brugmann's derivation (Gr<sup>2</sup>. II. 1, 276) from *ἀγχιστο-* (§ 43), but in this as in several words following *-st(h)īno-s* seems to me an integer.

28. (g) *προμη-στίνος* 'prae manu stans'. Hoffmann's analysis of this word (conveniently synopsized in Prellwitz, s. v. and by

<sup>1</sup> Not every adverb in *-στί* contains a form of *-sthā*, e. g. *μελεῖστι* 'limb-meal, limb-from-limb', with posterius *-Fiori* 'division' from the root *vid(h)-* of *di-videre* (see Fay, AJPh. 26, 381-2) cf. Poetam ab. Cic. N. D. 3, 67, *membraque articulatim dividit*. In OBulg. *оzi-visti* 'augenscheinlich, offenbar', we have a comparable derivative from the root of *vidēre*.

<sup>2</sup> Lat. *manubiae* 'booty' could also be derived from a locative *manubī*, employed first with *capta* (cf. the glossic definition by *manu capta*) and extended on the analogy of *induviae*, *exuviae*. This leaves the term. tech. of the augural ritual unaccounted for, wherein *manubiae* is the designation of varieties of lightning' (Festus, de Ponor, 92, 15). This passage almost demands that we take *-biae* in the sense of 'strokes': *bhēy-* 'to strike' (Fay, AJPh. 32, 403 sq.). The sense of 'booty' will then derive from the verbal sense 'to get by striking' (see AJPh. 26, 193; Cl. Quart., 1, 29, *apropos* of Lat. *hostus* 'produce'). But we might start with *\*manu-būjae*, refashioned after *induviae exuviae*, with posterius from *\*bhādyā-*: Germ. *beute* (see Kluge, s. v.). The root *bhā-d-* found in Eng. *beat* (see also below, § 54, on *fustis* 'club') is cognate with *bhēy-*. Thus both explanations of *-biae* unite in a root *bhēy-* | *bhōw-(d)-* 'ferire', to which OIr. *būaid* 'victoria, praeda' would be allied; cf. OBulg. *do-bytl* = 'fenus (?praeda), victoria.'

Brugmann, l. s. c.) is positively brilliant—*si non ē vero, ē ben trovato*—but *\*ή πρόμνηστος* of “a lady before whom pass her wooers one by one”—as at the wooing of Helen, the wooing of Damayanti—is, after all, a somewhat airy reconstruction, and I prefer soberly to compare *\*προμνης*, an old local genitive (see Brugmann, l. c. II. 2, § 504) in composition (see also § 50) with *eminus comminus*.<sup>1</sup> The stem was *m(a)nā*, i. e. *man-* + *ā* as *μάρη* is *mar-* + *ā*. The definition of *προμνηστῖνοι* by ‘prae manu stantes’ entirely suits the only two occurrences of the word, viz.:

(i) φ 230, ἀλλὰ προμνηστῖνοι ἐσέλθετε, μηδ' ἄμα πάντες,  
πρῶτος ἐγώ, μετὰ δ' ὅμμες.

Here, as the context shows, *ἐσέλθετε* is inclusive of the speaker who says, in the loose Homeric way, “but go we in standing-close (*προμνηστῖνοι*), but not all together, I ahead, ye twain behind”, and vv. 242–244 record the reentry of Odysseus, followed by the joint entry of his two thralls.

(2) λ 232–234, οὐκ εἴων πίνειν ἄμα πάσας αἴμα κελαινόν.

αἱ δὲ προμνηστῖναι ἐπήισαν, ἡδὲ ἐκάστη  
δν γόνον ἐξαγόρευεν· ἐγώ δ' ἐρίεινον ἀπάσας.

Homer, no more than Virgil, tells all the incidents. Here we read between the lines that telling her story was a condition precedent before any one of the heroines might drink of the blood offering. Odysseus with drawn sword made all come and stand close before him (*προμνηστῖναι*), each to tell her tale severally<sup>2</sup> before being dismissed to drink her share of the blood.

29. (h) Lat. *clandestinus*, from *clamde-* ‘in occulto’ (see Thes. L. L. III, 1246, 3 for the adverb *clamde*) + *-stīnus*. The word was as old as the Twelve Tables in the locution *coitiones clandestinae*.

(i) Lat. *media-stīnus*, see § 80.

(j) Lat. *libertinus* is as likely to contain original *-stīnos*, as to be an extension of *liber(s)tus* ‘frei-stehend’ (§ 12).

(k) Lat. *intestina*. See § 74 b.

<sup>1</sup>I do not follow Brugmann (Gr<sup>2</sup>. II. 2, 768) in taking these as nominatives, but start with *\*ē man-os* (gen. ablv.) ‘from the hand, afar’ *\*com man-os* ‘sequens (§ 36, fn.) a manu’ (cf. O Bulg. *sū* ‘cum’ (with instrum.), but ‘de’ (with gen.). In these coalescents we have a consonant stem *man-* that has been invoked to explain Lat. *mal-luvium* ‘hand-washing’: Umbr. *man-f* (acc. plur.).

<sup>2</sup>I think I should hardly be going too far to render *ἐκάστη* by ‘standing apart’ [from *\*éka(σ) + στη* as Joh. Schmidt long ago recognized (cf. Fraenkel, KZ. 42, 245)].

NUMERALS WITH *-STHO-S* 'STANS'.

30. In AJPh. 31, 415 sq. I presented an account of the names of the numerals from three to nine as names of the digits<sup>1</sup> and for the first time, so far as I am aware, suggested that the ordinals were likely to be prior to the cardinals, that *sextus* '6th' might be prior to *sex* '6'.<sup>2</sup> In briefly restudying some of these ordinals it will be necessary to bear constantly in mind the use of *-stho-s* also to describe certain fingers and other parts of the body (§§ 59 sq.; 75).

31. The Italo-Celtic start-form *tri-sthos* 'tertius' (cf. *\*tri-sthis* in Lat. *testis* 'tercero, le tiers assistant', and note Pomponius, 143 (Ribb.<sup>3</sup>) *te . . . solum foras | seduxi ut ne quis esset testis tertius | praeter nos*) was defined as 'tip-stander', used of the third finger (of the left hand) as the tallest. Parallels for this definition from American Indian tongues are *Zuñi ha'z* '3' (=the equally dividing finger), Chippeway *nisswi* '3', said to be closely related to *nawi-nindj* 'middle of the hand', Montagnais *t'are* '3' (=the middle is bent), referring to count by depression of the fingers<sup>4</sup>), while the Ewe tongue of Africa designates '3' by *eto* = 'father' ("from the middle or longest finger").<sup>4</sup> See also on '8', § 40.

32. The start-form for '5' I wrote as *\*pen[g]-kwe* = 'thumb and' or 'hand and' (*peng-* = 'grasper'). I would now eliminate 'thumb' as a possibility, perhaps,—at least Conant's materials may be said hardly to warrant the notion that the thumb, rather than the whole hand or fist, gave the name of this numeral. The argument for the fist (see § 35) seems much strengthened by noting Av. *puṣṭa-* '5th' which comes quite normally from *pug-stho-s* (: Lat. *pugnus* 'fist') 'fist-standing', where *sthos* may describe the fist as held up to indicate the numerals—unless *sthos* has come by irradiation from the other ordinals. Here cf. O Bulg. *pešti* 'fist' from *\*pukst<h>is* : Lith. *kūmstę*

<sup>1</sup> In Botocudo *podzik* means 'finger', but also 'one', and *kripo* '2' means 'double finger' (Conant, The Number Concept, p. 48).

<sup>2</sup> In the Handbook of Amer. Ind. Languages, p. 1048, it is expressly remarked that *arvingat* '6' in the tongue of the Labrador Eskimos "corresponds to the Greenland ordinal *arFerpat* THE SIXTH"; and that Labrador *agg* '2' = Greenland *arLaa* '2d'.

<sup>3</sup> Sometimes (see Handb. Am. Ind. I., 354) the count started with the clenched hand and the fingers were opened as counted. After this fashion *\*tri(s)sthos* might have meant 'the tip is standing' (see § 10 fn.).

<sup>4</sup> These statements are taken from Conant, I. s. c. pp. 48, 62, 53, 92.

(= \**kūmpstē* < v. Brugmann, Gr<sup>2</sup>. I. 410, anm. >) —produkt proethnischer vermisching der durch lat. *pugnus* und ai. *muṣṭh* vertretenen sippen unter hereinspielen der wurzel von ahd. *fēhtan*<sup>1</sup> (Niederman, IF. 26, 45). Polynesian *lima* 'hand' also = '5' (Encycl. Brit., II, p. 117).

33. With the start-form \**pnkst(h)i-s* before us let us look at Skr. *pañkti-s* (acc. plur.) in RV. 10, 117, 8 (=Av. 13, 3, 25, with unimportant variants). In stanzas 1-7 of this hymn, but with some vagueness in stz. 7, the poet sings the praises of a bounteous giver. In stz. 8 *pādas* a b c d run in Latin as follows:

a unipes [i. e. Sol] magis bipede progressus est  
 b bipes tripedem [i. e. cum baculo euntem] anteit a  
     tergo [sc. proficiscens]  
 c quadrupes venit bipedum vocatu  
 d conspicatus *pañktih* adgrediens [sc. est].

What are the *pañktis* at the sight of which the quadrupeds approach? The hands, I assume, of their biped masters. Thus *pañkti* (in AV. *pañ(k)tīm*, acc. sg.) is a riddle word like *tripedem* (Skr. *tripādam*) in b, and the next stanza starts off assuming the answer to the riddle with the words:

9a. similes tamen manus [Skr. *hāstāu*, dual] non simile laborant: Wherefore I rede the riddle thus: the pet quadruped seeing his master's raised hands approaches to find that one hand contains some dainty, the other not. And this is the whole content of stz. 9 which goes on to rehearse the difference of the two hands, of cōuterine milk-cows, of twins, of near kinsmen, in point of toil, yield, strength and generosity. Only in the light of stz. 9 does stz. 8 mean anything and then only by interpreting *pañkti* as explained by *hāstāu*. The *pādas* of stz. 9 are isolated in the Vedic literature and must have been composed for the identical place where we find them. On the other hand, stz. 8 appears in AV. rubricated in a sun hymn (*ab* twice so rubricated), and the only propriety of their usage lies in the initial word *ékapāt*,<sup>1</sup> a riddling name for the sun. The stanza was an ancient riddle, take it, and the three points to guess out were what is *ékapāt* (unipes), what is *tripādam* (tripedem), what are the *pañkti-s*; and as the last question was overhard, inasmuch as the concrete sense

<sup>1</sup> This sort of rubrication of Vedic stanzas is very common in the ritual literature (see p. 22 of my dissertation, The RV. Mantras in the Grhya-sūtras).

of *pañkti*- had waned before its numeral sense, the next stanza (9) went on with *hastāu* to give a clue, and it is only when we closely combine stz. 8 with stz. 9 that the former reveals any connection with the hymn on giving bounty.

34. We best understand the use of *pañkti*- as 'row, series' (the habitual rendering in the passage discussed above) if we start with the sense of 'hand', cf. below (§ 35) on Montagnais *se-sunla-re* '5' = the row on the hand, and note that the Nengones call 10 *rewe tubenine* = 2 series (of fingers), v. Conant, Numeral Concept, p. 63.

35. Conant's collections do not explicitly reveal the identification of the thumb with 5 anywhere, but a method of pricing still in vogue in the East gesticulates 6 (or 60) by combining the thumb with the little finger (Conant, p. 18) and, unless it stands for hand, one of the two fingers—for in some systems of digital count the little finger is five (on Banks Island, e. g. Conant, p. 16) and the thumb 1—indicates 5 and the other 1. The Zuñi word for 5, *öpte*, means 'notched off', and this is a most appropriate designation of the thumb (cf. on Skr. *añgū-sthā-s*, § 61), but Conant interprets "notching off" as "stopping" (p. 48). In the Klamath count one closed fist indicates 5 and both fists closed 10 (p. 59), and the gesture for 10 is the same on Banks Island (p. 16). Montagnais 5 is *se-sunla-re* = the row on the hand (p. 53). Tamanac 5 is *amgnaitone* = one hand complete (p. 55). Betoyna 5 is *teente* = hand (p. 57). The Maipures say *papitaerri capiti* = one only hand for 5 (p. 56). In Zamuco 5 is *tsuenayimana-ite* = ended one hand (p. 56), and Karankawa 5 is *natsa behema* = one father (see §§ 31, 41), i. e. of the fingers (p. 69), which looks like a designation of the thumb from its strength. Jiviro 5 is *alacötegladu* = one hand (p. 61), and Vilelo 5 is *isig-nisle-yaagit* = hand fingers one (p. 60). In Pawnee the word for 5 generally refers to one hand or foot (Handbook of Amer. Indians, p. 353). Another designation of 5, better suited to 10 in the Indo-European system (see AJPh. 31, 422), is Algonquin *nahran* = gone (p. 161); cf. Massachusetts *napanna* '5' = on one side (p. 159) and Tlingit *ké'djin* '5' = up-hand (Handbook of Amer. Ind. Languages, p. 198). [In Pawnee 4 is 'all the fingers, thumb excluded', see Hdbk. Am. Indians, p. 353].

36. The Indo-European start-form for 6th-6 was *ksw-ek[s]-sthō-s*, from still earlier *skū-* 'with' + *eks* 'out' + *sthō-s* 'stand-

ing'.<sup>1</sup> Prior to the development of Skr. *gasthá-s* '6th' there had been an assimilation of the start-form to  $\bar{k}s(w)$ -  $\bar{e}k[s]$ -*stho-s* whence, with continued assimilation of the  $\bar{k}s$  groups, *gasthá-s*. In Av. *xšta-* '6th' we have the start-form *ks(w)[e\bar{k}s]th<w>o-*<sup>2</sup> with a haplographic shortening as in Lat. *exta* from \**exsecta*, but *xšwaš* '6' is normal from \**kswe\bar{k}s*, shortened from \**kswe\bar{k}[s]*-*sthos* (see AJPh. 31, 420). From the same short form, with assimilation, viz.:  $\bar{k}s(w)\bar{e}k[s]$ , comes Lith. *szesz-i* '6', whereas OBulg. *šestī* '6' is from *(k)s(w)-\bar{e}k[s]*-*sthi-s* '6th', a precious instance of ordinal form (-*sthis*: *sthos* as in Lat. *testis* 'le tiers assistant': Osc. *trstus* 'testes', OIr. *triss* 'tertius') in cardinal<sup>3</sup> function, cf. the ordinal *šestū* (posterior, -*stho-s*) and § 30 fn. 2. The posterior -*sthi-s* with loss of aspiration appears in Skr. *śaṣti-s*<sup>4</sup> '60' (see § 35 for an identical digital gesture for 6 = 60). From *šestī* -*ti* spreads to other numerals in Old Bulgarian, e. g. *pečti* 5, *devečti* 9, *deszeti* 10. Nearest of kin to OBulg. *šestī* is Alban. *g'aštē* from \**sest-* with some sort of -*iyo-* suffix (cf. Lat. *Sestius*, Skr. *gaṣṭhya-s* 'sexta pars'). This *sest-* comes let us say from *(k)s(w)\bar{e}k[s]*-*sthyā*<sup>5</sup> (fem., cf. Skr. *gaṣṭhi*) whence, with corresponding treatment by assimilation of the *ks* groups, \**sesthyā*.

<sup>1</sup> The preposition *skā-* is from the root of Lat. *sequor* 'I follow', *socius* 'companion' (cf. *secū-tus* 'following'), with a proethnic metathesis to *ksu-* in Greek *ξε-ν* and the tautological *μεταξύ* 'between' (cf. Lat. *circumcirca* and, with adverbial sense, *προσέτε*; also Eng. *roundabout*). Another preposition from this root was \**skwom* 'with', which had lost its *s-* proethnically in combinations such as that exhibited in Umbrian *veris-co = portis-cum* (with the sense of *apud portas*), wherein -*skwom*, following an instr. plural in -*s*, lost its own *s-*. The velar of *skwom* is attested in Welsh *pwy* (*pwy gilydd* = 'ad suum comitem' [v. Thurnysen, Hdbch., p. 456]), an admirable example to illustrate the cognation of *pwy* [from (s)kwom] with *secundum*). Old Latin *quom* 'with' also attests *kw* (*kw*). This (s)kw(m) alternated with (s)kwu- or (s)ku-. Volscian *co-uehriu* = Lat. *curia* (from \**co-ūrio-*) may have been dissimilated from *k(w)o-wiria* (cf. *subsecivus* 'sequens' from -*sek(w)iwo-s*). From *kwu-* as well as from \**kwom* we may derive OBulg. *kū* 'erga, secundum', and \**kwu* may have been dissimilated to *ku-* proethnically, carrying with it *k(w)o-m*. Further prepositions from the root *sekw-* are collected by Brugmann, Gr<sup>2</sup>. II, 2, 894.

<sup>2</sup> This <*w*> belongs to the root as found in Skr. *sthāvard-s* 'stans', I conjecture. Whitney (Roots, etc.) cites -*sthāva* as a posterior, see on *octāvus*, § 40.

<sup>3</sup> G. Meyer identified Alban. *g'aštē* '6' with Skr. *gaṣti-s* '60' (v. KZ, 36, 284).

<sup>4</sup> G. Meyer identified -*te* with Lith. -*ti*, OBulg. *ī* (Alb. Stud. II, 51, 69 sq.), but the identification with -*t(i)yā-* is also possible as in *pese* (= \**pe(n)ktyā*) '5'.

Alban. *št* in *g'ašte* cannot come from *-kst(h)-* as *djaθtε* = O Bulg. *destü* 'dexter', with *θt* from *-kst-*, clearly shows. As Meyer (Woert. s. v.) pronounces *djaθtε* a precise equation with O Bulg. *destü*, *g'ašte* may perhaps come from *\*sest(h)o-s*.

37. For the designation of '6' by the second thumb there is much warrant in Conant's collections, as follows: Besides general statements that 6=either the right little finger or more often the right thumb (p. 16), note for '6' Jiviro *intimutu*=thumb [of second hand] (p. 61), Zamuco *tsomara-hi*=one on the other [hand omitted] (p. 56), Maipures *papita yana pauria capitī pureva*=one of the other hand we take (p. 56), Zulu *tatisitupa*=taking the thumb (Encyc. Brit. II. p. 117). Of curious interest (p. 92) is Ewe *ade* '6' = the other going (cf. *de* '1' = a going, i. e. a beginning and Zuñi *töpinte* '1' = taken to start with, forms which suggest that IE. *oino-* 'one' also meant 'a going'. With these examples before us the explanation of IE. *(k)s(w)-ek[s]-sthos* as 'co-ex-stans,' descriptive of the second thumb in an enumeration, seems to me substantially demonstrated, especially as the tongues that designate 6 by 'thumb' are like Indo-European also in not necessarily indicating 5 by the other thumb. If one reflects on the perfect propriety of co-ex-stans for 'thumb' (see § 3); and that the complicated start-form *ksw-ek(s)-sthos* yields, without any sort of forcing, this definition; and that the simple assumption of continued assimilation between the *ks* groups accounts for the Protean forms of this numeral in the derived languages, he must attach little value to the thing called common sense if he still chooses to shrug out a cry of accidental coincidence.

38. In the *th* of Skr. *caturthā-s* '4th' we have the best of testimony that the original start-form ended in *-r-stho-s* (AJPh. 31, 418; supra, § 12). Sanskrit was the only language that could have yielded this evidence, and it does so by its *-th-*. Cf. also *saptā-tha-s* '7th', Av. *haptā-tha-*, with incontiguous *s-* dissimilation from *\*septm-stho-s*.

39. This exhausts the numerals of the first decade wherein *-stho-s* 'standing' is traceable, but a few remarks may be added on the others. For the possible semantic and other connections between IE. 4 and 7 (see Fay, l. c. §§ 37, 38, 45) note that in the Muralug system of Torres Strait, where 7 is the left and 13 the right elbow, these numbers have a joint name=elbow, and only the touching of the one or the other makes clear which is meant (Conant, p. 17-18). Not infrequently 7 is the 2d finger of the

2d hand (Hdbk. Am. Ind. I. 353). In Tsimshian, 7 (=*t'epqall*) is the 2d 2 (=*tepqat*), but is pronounced in the Handbook Am. Ind. Lang., which employs a different transliteration, the same as 2 (p. 397; Conant, p. 164) cf. also Labrador *aggārtut* '7': *agga* '2' (Hdbk., p. 1048). For the identification of 7 with the index finger cf. Jiviro *tannituna* (Conant, p. 61). In Zulu "the verb *komba* 'to point', indicating the forefinger, or 'pointer', makes the next numeral, seven—and a Zulu would say *Ukombile* 'he pointed with his forefinger', i. e. 'he gave me seven'" (Conant, p. 62)—all of which makes for the connection of Lat. *septem* with *sapio* (see AJPh. 31, 487), but rather in the sense of 'I am wise'. In Navaho the index finger is *hāla tsōsts'ēdi* = *digitus septimus*, though the Franciscan Fathers in their elaborate work on this tongue elsewhere say that this tribe began the count of the second pentad with the little finger of the right hand, not the thumb.

40. In my discussion of the numeral 8th—8 the point on which I laid most weight was the analysis of *ðydoos* into *ok* 'tip' + *dwoyos* 'bis'. I omitted to mention Skr. *aqñi-s* '80', wherein I see a dual word \**aqñi*<sup>1</sup> = 'two tips' + a -*ti*- that irradiated from *qas̤ti-s* '60' (see § 36). Lat. *octō* represents a start-form *ok* + *dwōw* 'two', whose first *w*, in the heavy consonant group, was lost by dissimilation. The assimilation of *kd* to *kt* was due to the influence of the *pt* of the *septem*- *sept.* Lat. *octavus* '8th', like *ðydoos*, is unique, and I could find only *prāvus* 'forward, foward' (lit. 'first') with a possibly similar ending. Perhaps we should write \**ok*-*sthāwos* 'tip-standing' as the start-form (see § 36 fn.).

41. Yes, the really important thing in my study of 8th and 8 was the definition of *ok* as 'tip', describing the middle finger of the 2d hand in the digital count (see Handbook Amer. Ind., I. 353), and corresponding with \**tri-sthos* 'tip-standing' = 3 on the first hand. Parallels for all this from the savage tongues exist in plenty. The Hudson Bay Eskimos say *kittukleemoot* (= 'middle finger') for 8 and Jiviro 8 is *tannituna cabiasu* = 'index finger next finger' (Conant, p. 61). Cheyenne *notoyos* 'middle finger' is closely related to *na-nohhtu* '8' (Conant, p. 62). Niam-Niam 8 is *batti-biata* = 2d 3 (cf. *batissa* = 2d 1, *batiw-wi* = 2d 2, *batti-biama* = 2d 4, (Conant, p. 64)). While the Karankawa used

<sup>1</sup>It may be that the Lithuanian cardinals in -*i*, from 4 to 9, correspond with \**aqñi* in their ending.

for 5 *natsa-behema* = 1 father (of the fingers), they used *haikia behema* = 2 fathers (?) for 8 (Conant, p. 69). In their 5, 'father' designates the strength of the thumb (? *pollex*, but see AJPh. 31, 419), but in 8 the length of the middle finger (cf. Ewe *eto* 'father' for 3, § 31; cf. § 35).<sup>1</sup>

42. I wrote the start-form for 9 as *ne-wenos* 'not winning' (l. c. 422), but later (p. 423, fn. 1) noted how curious it was that *new-en-de-kmt* (9-10) lent itself to interpretation as 'now-on-to-hind-(most). A curious illustration is furnished by Choctaw *chokali* '9' = soon the end (Conant, p. 162). Conant's lists (pp. 160 sq.) furnish plenty of examples of words implying end for 5 or for 10. Thus Delaware *tellen*, Shawnee *metathwe*, Old Algonquin *mitasso*, Chippeway *metosswoy* [the three last obviously cognate] mean 'no more' or 'no further'. The Hudson Bay Eskimos use *eerkitkoka* for 10 and for 'little finger' (Conant, p. 48).

EDWIN W. FAY.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS.

<sup>1</sup> It may be noted for its curious interest that Skr. *girt-s* 'mons' also meant 8, the current explanation whereof is from a locality where there were eight mountains.

## II.—CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE STUDY OF HOMERIC METRE.

### II. LENGTH BY POSITION.<sup>1</sup>

The first chapter of the second part of Solmsen's *Untersuchungen zur Griechischen Laut- und Verslehre*, pp. 129–186, is entitled *Ueber metrische wirkungen und wesen des digamma*, and aims at showing that the digamma can aid in making position only under the following circumstances: (1) In the interior of a word; in other positions only (2) when the lengthened syllable is in the arsis, the lengthening being then due in reality to the force of the ictus; or (3) when the apparently lengthened syllable stands in the first or second thesis, the 'freedom' of using a single short syllable for the thesis being a privilege of the first two feet. This is a revival of the theory of Hartel, *Homerische Studien III, Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften Wien* 1874, lxxviii, pp. 7–87, which Solmsen has extended to include the cases of  $\delta F$ -,  $F\lambda$ - and  $F\rho$ - and for which he has provided a new phonetic interpretation. Solmsen's conclusions have met with the approval among others of Sommer (cf. below) and of Bechtel, *Die Vocalcontraction bei Homer*, p. ix, and have been opposed, so far as I know, only by Danielsson, *Zur Lehre vom homerischen Digamma*, *IF. xxv*, 264–84, if we disregard Blass' incidental protest *Hermes*, xxxvii, 473. Convincing as I find Danielsson's argumentation, it seems to me that it is possible to strengthen it still further, and that it is desirable to do so both because of the bearing of this theory upon the Homeric question, and because the appearance of Sommer's article, *Zur griechischen Prosodie*, *Glotta*, i, 145–240, has since supposedly given new support to Solmsen's theory.

The statistics compiled by Hartel which serve as the foundation of Solmsen's argument may be exhibited in the following table<sup>2</sup>:

<sup>1</sup>See *A. J. P. XXVIII* 401–410.

<sup>2</sup>That they require correction in the light of our present knowledge of the range of the digamma does not affect the argument, cf. Solmsen, p. 132 n.

## The influence of initial F before a vowel:

Is manifested		Is not manifested	
In Arsis.	In Thesis.	In Arsis.	In Thesis.
a) by preventing			
000	2324	elision of short vowel	324
507	164	shortening of long	
		vowel or diphthong	000 78
359	(46)	b) by 'making position'	000 215

Of the 46 instances of 'position lengthening' in the thesis 42 belong to the pronominal forms (*οι* 41, *εύ* 1); while three others (P 142, Ω 419, γ 472) are in the first thesis, leaving only a single example in the second thesis: θ 215 *εὐ μὲν τόξον οἴδα εἴξοον ἀμφα-*  
*φάσσθαι.*

To these facts Solmsen demands that we shall no longer close our eyes, but endeavor to understand them scientifically. To be compared with them are the facts exhibited by the following table compiled from Solmsen, pp. 133-136, omitting the examples of *λίσταμαι* on account of the uncertainty of the etymology.

## A short vowel before δF-, Fρ-, Fλ-:

Is lengthened		Remains short	
In Arsis.	In Thesis.	In Arsis.	In Thesis.
122	4 <sup>2</sup>	00	62 (63)

<sup>2</sup> Always in the first thesis.

On these facts Solmsen seems to have reasoned as follows, cf. p. 132: Under a) we find about 3000 cases in which the influence of the digamma is manifested, and only about 400 in which it is 'neglected'; we may therefore conclude with the vast majority of scholars that the verses containing these 400 examples were composed at a time when the digamma had vanished from the living usage of the language. Under b) and in the second table the distribution of the examples is totally different. The examples before the pronoun do not belong here, but are to be explained, p. 130: "aus der enklitischen natur des personal pronomens, kraft deren *οι*, *εύ* mit dem vorhergehenden worte zu einer einheit verwachsen, fuer die nicht die behandlungsweise des aus- und anlauts, sondern die des wortinlauts massgebend ist"; the examples in the first thesis may be classed as *στίχοι λαγαποί*; while various explanations can be given for θ 215. For in the first place emendation *-τόξον γ' οἴδα-* is extremely easy; or, secondly, the irregularity may be debited to the "spaeling" who composed this part of the Odyssey; or, finally, cf. Rh. M. 60. 492, it may

be taken as an indication that the second foot also has its special privileges. Setting aside these 50 examples we see that 'position is made' 481 times in the arsis, never in the thesis; while 'position is neglected' never in the arsis, but 277 (278) times in the thesis. Under these circumstances it seems proper to ascribe the lengthening in the arsis to the force of the arsis (ictus), and to regard the syllables remaining short in the thesis as representing the language's natural treatment of a syllable ending in a short vowel before the combinations of consonants in question. The problem thus reduces itself to the question: Why do not  $-v$  F-,  $-p$  F-,  $-s$  F- have the same effect on the preceding syllable which  $-v$   $\pi$ -,  $-p$   $\tau$ -,  $-s$   $\kappa$ -, etc., exert.

The explanation is to be found by giving heed to the doctrines long since established by the science of Phonetics. According to Sievers<sup>4</sup>, § 651 (=<sup>5</sup>, § 709) the essential thing in a syllable 'long merely by position' is that one or more consonants belonging to the syllable shall follow after its short vocalic element. Consequently if a group of consonants can be drawn to the following syllable, the quantity of the preceding syllable will remain unaffected. Whether this is possible or not will depend upon the relative 'sonority' of the consonants. For, according to Sievers<sup>4</sup>, § 490 ff. (=<sup>5</sup>, § 527 ff.) there must be a rise of sonority from the beginning of the syllable to its vocalic element. Now the digamma was a semi-vowel  $w$ , not a spirant  $v$ ; as such it was superior in sonority to  $n$ ,  $r$ , or  $s$ , and consequently syllables beginning  $nwa$ -,  $rwa$ - or  $swa$ - are possible. Accordingly the natural pronunciation of  $\kappa\pi\gamma\mu\nu\omega$   $F\epsilon\pi\alpha\omega$  was  $kr\acute{e}gu\ddot{o}\text{-}nweipas$  and similarly for all other cases in the thesis. But in the arsis the force of articulation was more than usual, and hence (p. 166) it is stated: "Wenn es andererseits  $F\epsilon\pi\alpha\omega$   $F\epsilon\pi\omega$  heisst, so ist der schliessende consonant hier in der arsis dank der besonders kraestigen expiration, mit der diese hervorgebracht wurde, bei der vorhergehenden silbe geblieben," with which is to be compared the fuller explanation given on p. 164: "Trat diese silbe aber in die hebung, d. h. wurde der expirationsstrom, mittels dessen sie hervorgebracht wurde, verstaeckt und zugleich verlaengert, so erreichte er sein ende nicht mehr mit dem schliessenden vocale selbst, sondern umfasste auch noch den ersten laut jener verbindungen ganz oder teilweise, die silbe als solche wurde 'positione' lang".

At first sight this theory seems to provide a uniform and

simple solution for a vexatious problem ; on further examination, however, it can in my opinion be shown to be untenable. The phonetic doctrines in the first place, which are put forward with such confidence, cf. p. 161 : "Die lautphysiologie hat darueber laengst klarheit geschafft, ihre lehren sind aber bei der beurtheilung metrischer phaenomene bisher nicht immer genuegend beherzigt worden", are in fact seriously questioned by other phoneticians, as may be seen from a comparison of Jespersen, Lehrbuch der Phonetik, § 209, and Scripture, Elements of Experimental Phonetics, p. 449 ff. The dualism of Sievers' theory which defines the syllable now as the portion of sound uttered with a single puff of breath (so that e. g. *body* may be a single syllable) and again as the portion of sound lying between two sound minima (so that *body must* be two syllables) is justly criticised by Jespersen. For Solmsen's purpose it is, however, indispensable because he must operate both with a division *nwa-* on the principle of sonority and again with a division *n-wa-* on the breath-puff principle, cf. also the double treatment of  $\pi\ddot{a}/\tau\rho\acute{o}s$  and  $\pi\ddot{\tau}\cdot\rho\acute{o}s$ . Furthermore Jespersen states that the principle of sonority can determine only the summits of the syllables, and is not of the least help in determining where one syllable ends and the next begins. Indeed, the reality of such divisions, when there is 'close contact', is to be denied, cf. § 205 : "Das einzige was hier (i. e. in *feste*) vorliegt, sind zwei Gipfel mit dazwischenliegender Senkung, aber es ist eben so muessig, sich darueber zu streiten, ob diese Senkung ganz zum ersten Gipfel oder ganz zum zweiten oder halb zu beiden gehoert, wie es muessig ist, in einem Tal in der Natur nach einer bestimmten Scheide zwischen zwei Bergen zu suchen". Upon this subject Scripture is equally definite, cf. p. 450 : "I do not believe, however, that a division of the flow of speech into separate blocks (termed 'syllables') has the slightest justification or the slightest phonetic meaning". A corollary—the futility of dividing Homeric Greek into syllables, when we are unable to do the same for languages which we speak and hear daily—is drawn by Jespersen, p. 201, anm. 1, in a form more sarcastic than I care to quote in this connection. Not being a phonetician myself, I must leave to others the further discussion of these phonetic doctrines ; but, even on the basis of the Sievers theory, Solmsen's treatment of the digamma becomes involved in insuperable difficulties.

In the first place the lengthening before *oi* is explained, cf. above, as due to its enclitic nature, thanks to which it fuses with the preceding word, so that the consonant group is treated according to the "behandlungsweise des wortinlauts". On the one hand this takes no account of the passages, *B* 665 (?), *E* 338, *z* 90, 101, 289, *II* 735, *Y* 282, *Ψ* 865, *Ω* 53, 72, *ε* 234, *ν* 430, *ο* 105, in which *oi* 'fails to make position'. On the other hand, if the theory is to be consistent, it must demand 'position lengthening' in the case of all other words which are "zu einer einheit verwachsen". What words are to be considered thus fused, is a question on which scholars differ in practice; and as I know of no definition by Solmsen himself I shall follow that of Sommer, p. 147, though I believe that he has drawn the lines too narrowly. His fifth class enclitics or postpositive particles may be taken first as offering the closest parallel. Here belong *κτίλος Φώς* *Γ* 196 and the similar passages, *Θ* 94, 271, *N* 137, *χ* 299. Of the article and noun (Class I) we have no examples for the digamma, but under it are to be included (p. 152) examples of adjective and noun, such as *μελιηδέος Φοίνου* *Σ* 545, *δαίφρονος Φοινεῖδαο* *Ε* 813, *έδν Φοίκον* *Ψ* 8, *περιμήκει Φράθδω* *κ* 293, *ενανθέι Φλάχνη* *λ* 320. A weakly accented pronominal subject (Class II) occurs in *εἰ τις Φίδοντο* *Γ* 453, cf. *Ω* 337; a weakly accented pronominal object (Class III) in *οἱ μιν Φίδοντο* *Δ* 374, cf. *Ε* 845, *ψ* 91; preposition and noun (Class IV) *ἐπὶ Φρυμῷ Ω* 271, *ἐις Φοίκον* *β* 52, *ξ* 318, *ρ* 84, *ἐις Φίλιον* *Ε* 204, *Φ* 81, 156, *ξ* 238, *ρ* 104, *ἐις Φέκαστον* *Ι* 180, *ἐν Φιλίῳ Ω* 67, *ἐν Φεκάστῃ* *Β* 719, *πρὸς Φὸν λέχος Α* 609, *πρὸς Φὸν μεγαλίτορα θυμόν* *Δ* 403, etc., and presumably Solmsen would read *πὰρ Φίλου* *Δ* 166, *α* 259. Class VI a weakly accented particle which modifies the sentence is too well represented to render full citation profitable, but cf. *πρῶτος μὲν Φάναξ* *Η* 162, *Ψ* 288, and *B* 70, 802, *Θ* 233, *I* 374, *N* 278, etc., etc. To these we should add at least examples of such close syntactic combinations (cf. Ehrlich KZ xl. 393 f.) as, *κρήγυον Φείρας* *Α* 106, *ιερὰ Φρέξας* *Α* 147, *κακὰ Φρέξαι* *Γ* 354, cf. *Ε* 403, *Δ* 502, 838, *Υ* 186, *Φ* 214, *εἰδος Φιδόντες* *Γ* 224, *οὐδὲν Φείρογύως* *χ* 318. And *a fortiori* the cases of compound words like *παρΦείρη*, *ὑπΦείξομαι*, after the treatment of which on p. 159, we must presume that Solmsen also understands *ἐσΦιδοῦσα*, *εἰσανΦιδόνη*, *ἐκκατΦιδώνη*. In all of these cases, in which Solmsen's theory demands 'position lengthening' before the digamma<sup>1</sup>, our text actually shows a short vowel. Danielsson,

<sup>1</sup> Sommer's remark, p. 150, is incomprehensible to me.

who felt this difficulty in part, is of the opinion (p. 274) that it may perhaps be avoided without too great difficulty. I, however, do not see how this can be done, unless it be conceded that the neglect of the digamma is evidence that these verses too were composed at a time when the digamma had vanished from the living usage of the language. Such an explanation would be correct, but it would be permitting the entrance of the wedge which would disrupt the theory.

A minor inconsistency is that to explain  $\pi\alpha/\rho\text{Fe}\bar{\iota}\pi\eta$ , we must regard *w* as more sonorous than *r*; while on the other hand *iep\alpha/\text{Fe}\bar{\iota}\text{gas}* shows that *r* exceeds *w* in sonority. Much more significant is the fact that on the principle of 'sonority syllables' divisions such as *sma-*, *sna-*, *sra-*, *sla-* are required, and consequently there should be no 'position lengthening' before *-s μ-*, *-s ν-*, *-s ρ-*, *-s λ-*. Sommer foresaw this objection, but his attempt to obviate it, p. 174, does not seem to me successful. That the difference between *s* and *r* is negligible, while that between *r* and *w* is not, seems to me a Procrustean adaptation of the theory to the facts. One who scans  $\pi\ddot{\alpha}/\rho\text{Fe}\bar{\iota}\pi\eta$ , *κρήγνο*/*v\text{Fe}\bar{\iota}\pi\alpha*, should also demand *\*παιδέ*/*σλίποντο*.

Other objections to the theory—that it assumes syllables beginning *nwa-*, *rwa-* such as cannot be proved for the older periods either of Greek or of other Indo-European languages; that it runs counter to what we know of the effect of *w-* in making position in Latin and Vedic poetry—may be passed over with a reference to Danielsson, p. 275 ff. The latter scholar has also explained most satisfactorily the points of real significance in Hartel's statistics. The final redaction of our poems (and the composition of parts of them) fell in a period when digamma was no longer spoken in the Ionic dialect. In close combinations of words (Konnexe), however, the resulting hiatus remained; thus  $\delta\epsilon\text{ Fo}\iota$  became  $\delta\epsilon\text{ o}\iota$  and only later by recombination  $\delta'\text{ o}\iota$ , and similarly  $\dot{\nu}\pi\delta\text{ "I}\lambda\iota\text{o}\nu$ ,  $\kappa\alpha\text{ l}\dot{\alpha}\sigma\tau\text{v}$  were spoken for a time after all traces of the initial consonant had been lost in freer combinations of these words. Cf. also Thumb, IF. ix, 327. Besides hiatus in the verse was justified at certain points by the caesurae and diaereses, and the final vowels of words, such as  $\delta$ ,  $\ddot{\delta}$ ,  $\tau\delta$ ,  $\pi\rho\delta$ ,  $\tau\iota$ ,  $\tau\dot{\iota}$ ,  $\ddot{\sigma}\tau\iota$ ,  $\pi\tau\rho\iota$ , etc., were never or rarely elided. Under these influences the hiatus occasioned in the older text by the subsequent loss of the digamma seemed justified, was perpetuated in the tradition, and imitated in the later compositions. For 'posi-



tion lengthening' in the arsis, similar favorable conditions existed partly in the lengthening before caesurae, partly in the licenses of the first and sixth arses, and partly in the metrical lengthening of antispast and bacchic words. Most of the cases of lengthening in the thesis before (F)οι occur in cretic *Konnexe*; the order of words being unchangeable (cf. Wackernagel, IF. i, 333 ff.) and the metrical lengthening of such words again supplying a justification.

Apart from these cases the possibility of lengthening in the thesis was at the start narrowly limited. When there was a 'real separation of words' it was necessarily confined to the first and second theses, for reasons given briefly and correctly by Danielsson, p. 283, anm. 1, and which will be discussed in detail later. After the loss of the digamma such verses might be regarded as *οριχοι λαγαροι* and remain unchanged. Of them we have eight examples which are perhaps to be increased by emendation, cf. p. 265, anm. 4. The only other possibility for lengthening was in monosyllabic words compounded or closely connected with the following words: as examples Danielsson suggests παρ Φειπέμεν, δε ΦΔιον εξαλάπαξε, σὺ ν Φοῖσι τέκεσσι. The absence of such *Konnexe* is a fact for which Solmsen's theory can offer no explanation. Danielsson points out that after the loss of the digamma the verses would seem defective in a way without any parallel in Homeric versification, and that therefore such examples as did exist would necessarily be removed in the process of modernization.

There is, however, another point in Hartel's statistics which requires consideration. In some 400 instances there is total or partial elision of a vowel before words which once began with the digamma. Most investigators—including Solmsen, cf. p. 132—agree that these instances are to be explained as due to the fact that the digamma was no longer pronounced when the verses containing these examples were composed or revised into their present form. This being the case it follows that at that time a short syllable ending in a consonant would remain short before these words simply because in their new pronunciation the second consonant required to make the syllable long 'by position' is lacking. These 400 examples of elision demand therefore as their counterpart some instances<sup>1</sup> of what we call "neglected

<sup>1</sup> That all of them must fall in the thesis is a fact too obvious to mention.

position". A theory which removes all such examples discredits itself by proving too much.

At first sight it might seem that the instances of 'neglected position' are so numerous (277) as compared with the instances of elision (400) as to afford no prospect of explaining the bulk of them in this fashion; especially when we contrast the 2995 cases in which elision is prevented with the 531 cases in which position is made. However the problem is too complicated to be solved by such a simple proportion; other factors are involved. For in the first place it follows from the facts explained by Danielsson that we can have (apparent) neglect of position because the digamma is not pronounced, and at the same time hiatus, whether real or merely imitative. Secondly, making position in the thesis is turning a possible dactyl into a spondee, a thing which the poet will be inclined to avoid.<sup>1</sup> Finally the position lengthening in the thesis can take place in case of a 'real separation of words' only when there is a diaeresis after a spondee, the limitations on which will concern us later. Neglect of position on the other hand occurs either in a trochaic caesura or a dactylic diaeresis, which are the favorite divisions of the Homeric verse. A statistical solution of the problem is impossible, and we must therefore examine the context in which each example occurs to see whether we are justified in assuming that its author actually spoke initial digamma.

As evidence of the absence of the digamma we are warranted in accepting a single passage which shows elision and does not require emendation. Such a principle may be deduced from the practice of Bechtel, and if a theoretic justification of it is desired it can be found in Danielsson's article. Still this leaves the practical question of when emendation is required. On this subject Sommer, p. 149, lays down the principle "so wenig wie moeglich herumzudoktern", and Solmsen is ready with terms like "mit conjecturen heimsuchen", p. 157, for emendations of which he does not approve. Convenient as it would be to follow this practice, I prefer to take a more objective standard. Bechtel has shown that contraction (under certain limitations), iteratives, the use of *ες*, *ᾶν*, the article, the loss of intervocalic *ι*, and the use of the short forms of the dative plural of the first and second declensions, are phenomena which go hand in hand with the ab-

<sup>1</sup>In this connection cf. Witte, *Glotta*, ii. 8-18.

sence of initial digamma. An emendation made simply to restore a digamma is necessary only when the context shows none of these peculiarities, excepting of course such instances as are also to be removed by emendation. Furthermore some of the instances of 'neglected position' are in themselves sufficient proof. In the first place are to be counted as such the examples before the pronoun *οι*; and we have seen above that consistency requires the same for compounds, and for word groups, because in these the digamma if present must according to Solmsen produce lengthening as the "behandlungsweise des wortinlauts". In citing the examples I shall therefore print these with an asterisk prefixed but without further comment.

Even when such evidence is not available the absence of the digamma can sometimes be established more indirectly. As an example I shall take the Glaukos episode Z 119-236, which in spite of its length contains no evidence of the loss of the digamma unless it be Z 151 *ἡμετέρην γενεῖν πολλοὶ δέ μιν ἄνδρες θεασιν*. That we must so regard it and not read *ἄνδρες θεασιν* or reject the line with Bentley follows not merely from the other evidences of late date, cf. Bechtel, p. 18, *γνῶστι, ἦν, θάρσει, ἡνορέην, νός, ἔσκεν*;<sup>1</sup> but even more from the fact that this episode is shown by its contents to be the latest of the episodes in which the Lycians figure, cf. Robert, p. 402 ff., while these older episodes, cf. below, show the absence of the digamma.

I shall begin by selecting from the Iliad<sup>2</sup> the strata for which the absence of the digamma can be established with ease, and then see how many examples of 'neglected position' re-

<sup>1</sup> For the substitution of *ἦν* there is here no need.

<sup>2</sup> I have not examined the Odyssey because I consider it proved that the oldest parts of the Odyssey are not earlier than late parts of the Iliad. In reading Jacobsohn's interesting, but in its main contention unconvincing, article I note, *Hermes* xliv. 101, that on account of Solmsen, *Unters.*, p. 160, I should have included instances of *δυσηχέος* where clearly the "behandlungsweise des wortinlauts" must be demanded. The instances of *δυσηχέος* are all in late passages (B 686, H 376, 395, A 590, N 535, II 442, Σ 307, 464, X 180) except A 524, where *πολέμου δυσηχέος* should be read for *πολέμου δυσηχέος*. Witte, *Singular and Plural*, p. 79, anm. 1, adheres to the Hartel-Solmsen theory and operates with *λαδες Φεῦμελια Πριάμοιο*. In Homer—contrast *δρόπ' εὐ ειδῆς*—the word is without trace of digamma so that a direct equation with *νασιν* is most improbable, cf. Leo Meyer, and Prellwitz, *s. v.* This illustrates a weakness of the theory—the way in which it permits the assumption of a digamma where such a sound does not exist.

main and how they are to be explained. Not having access to Knos' work the examples have been collected by the aid of Hartel, Solmsen and Gehring. That I refer to Bechtel for the linguistic evidence of late date other than elision before digamma, and that I have followed in the main Robert's analysis requires no justification.

A. 438: *ἐκ δέ ἐκατόμβην βῆσαν ἐκηβόλω 'Απόλλωνι*

In the patchwork, cf. Hinrichs, *Hermes*, xvii., 59 ff., episode of the restoration of Chryseis A. 430-87, on which cf. Bechtel, p. 90, absence of the digamma is shown by *μεγάλ'* *ταχε* 482. Solmsen, p. 158, objects to the cogency of this example, presumably wishing to read with Schulze, *KZ.* xxix., 248, *μεγάλα FFάχε*. With Schulze's proposal to emend about twenty passages in this fashion I cannot entirely agree. Fourteen out of eighteen examples from the Iliad come from portions of the poem composed after the loss of the digamma; in these I should allow *ταχον*, etc., to stand as augmented forms of *ταχω*. The evidence of late date is to be strengthened by examining lines 423-7 and 488-96, the clamps by which the episode is held in place, cf. Robert, p. 558, Bechtel, p. 115. Robert's suggestion that this is the work of the mechanical soul which invented the *Μήνυδος ἀπόρρησις* is very probable and would clinch the question.

- \* A. 555 ..... *μή σε παρείπη*
- \* 609 *Ζεὺς δὲ πρὸς οὐ λέχος ἦν*

The scene on Olympus A. 533-611 furnishes also: *γ' εἰσεται*, 548; *τοσσεται ήδος*, 576; *γ' ἐπέεσσαι*, 582; for other evidence cf. Bechtel, p. 190, 272, and with the last of these *AJPh.* xxviii., 402. It is noteworthy that the second example is due to an effort to get rid of lengthening before mute and liquid, as the line must once have run *Ζεὺς δὲ πρὸς λέχος ηι(ε)*.

- \* B. 70 ..... *ώς δέ μὲν εἰπών*
- 219 ..... *ψεδνή δέ ἐπενήνοθε λάχνη*
- \* 233 ..... *οὐ μὲν έοικεν*
- \* 269 ..... *άχρειον ιδών* .....

The *Διάπειρα* B 53-381 contains also *νῦν δ' ιδεν* 82, *τοσσαντ' ἔτεα* 328, and frequent cases of contraction, cf. Bechtel, p. 12.

- \* Γ 196 *αὐτός δὲ κτίλος ὥς* .....
- \* 224 *οὐ τότε γ' ὥδ' Οδυσσῆος ἀγασσάμεθ'* *εἰδος ιδόντες*

The linguistic stage of the *Τειχοσκοπία*, Γ 121-244 is sufficiently

characterized by the evidence collected by Bechtel, p. 44. Disregard of the digamma is shown by line 224 itself and also in line 173 *θάνατός μοι ἀδεῖν*, and as this episode is closely interwoven with the 'Ορκοι we may add *οἰστερε δ' ἄρνε* in line 103, if the text be correct.

\* Γ 354 ξενοδόκον κακὰ ῥέξαι ....

The short prayer of Menelaos contains also *κάκ' ἔργεν* 351; in moral tone it resembles the 'Ορκοι and the fourth book, rather than the oldest stratum of the third. Originally 356 followed 349.

\* Γ 453 οὐ μὲν γὰρ φιλότητί γ' ἐκείθανον, εἰ τις ἰδοιτο.

A line remarkable both for its syntax and for the form *ἐκείθανον*. It stands in a passage 448-61 which is connective tissue between the 'Ορκοι and the 'Ορκίων σύγχυσις, both episodes in which the digamma is lost. Bechtel's verdict, p. 44, is "so konnte nur ein Rhapsode stammeln".

Δ 138 η ὁι πλεῖστον ἔρντο ....

On the one side is δο' ἥδει 132 and on the other δδ' ἐρέει 176; for the language of lines 1-219 cf. Bechtel, p. 44.<sup>1</sup>

- \* Δ 232 καὶ δο' οὐς μὲν σπείδοντας ἰδοι ....
- \* 240 οὐς τινας αὐν μεθιέντας ἰδοι ....
- \* 286 σφῶι μὲν οὐ γὰρ ἔοικ' ὄτρυνέμεν ....
- 287 .... ἀνάγετον ἱφι μάχεσθαι
- \* 341 .... ἐπέοικε ....
- \* 374 .... οἱ μιν ἰδοντο ....

The 'Αγαμέμνονος ἐπιπάλησις Δ 220-421 clearly presupposes the earlier part of the book from which cases of elision have just been cited. Moreover all but one of the instances occur in groups of closely united words. The evidence collected by Bechtel, p. 43, Robert, p. 211, includes contraction, iteratives, the short dative, loss of intervocalic *ι* and Ionic metathesis. There is therefore no reason to doubt that this section was composed after the loss of the digamma; and we must regard its examples of hiatus as merely imitative.

- E 23 ἀλλ' Ἡφαιστος ἔρντο ....
- \* 538 η δο' οὐς ἔγχος ἔρντο ....
- 606 .... μενεανέμεν ἱφι μάχεσθαι
- 706 .... Αἰτώλιον Οινόμαον τε

<sup>1</sup> All examples of the digamma claimed by Solmsen will be treated, though it will afterwards be shown that this is not a digamma word.

- \* 813 ..... δαίφρονος Οίνείδαο
- \* 845 ..... μή μν ίδοι.....
- \* 885 ..... ή τέ κε δηρόν
- \* 895 ἀλλ' οὐ μάν σ' ἔτι δηρὸν .....

These examples all come from portions recognized by Robert, p. 177 f., as belonging to the original stock of the Διομήδους ἀριστεία. This stratum contains also ἵππους δ' οὐς ἐτάροισι (165), οὐδ' ἔπει (879), and other indications of later date collected by Bechtel, pp. 43, 53.

- \* E 204 ..... πεζὸς ἐξ Ἰλιον εἰλήλοιθα

In an interpolation (192-208) made to establish a connection with the Ὀρκίων σύγχυσις, cf. Robert, p. 182, Bechtel, p. 50.

- \* E 338 .... πέπλου, ὃν οἱ Χάριτες κάμουν αἴται
- \* 403 ..... αἰσυλὰ βέζων
- \* 353 τὴν μὲν ἄροις Ἰρις ....

The last example is cited because on Solmsen's theory it could be read *ἄροις Ίρις*; that it really proves the loss of digamma for this passage is shown by *πὰρ δέ οἱ Ίρις* (365). The passages are from the Aphrodite episode (311-444), on which cf. Robert, p. 183, Bechtel, p. 156.

- \* E 451 ἀμφὶ δ' ἄροις εἰδῶλῳ .....

The short episode of the 'wraith' of Aineias (446-53, 512-18) is obviously still later; for its language cf. Bechtel, p. 195. We must therefore consider this passage as an instance of elision, and not read *ἄροις Ίριδῶλῳ*.

E 470=792 ὃς εἰπὸν διτρυνε μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἐκάστον.

The first of these lines has been shown by Robert to be connected with the introduction of the Sarpedon episode to which we are coming; the second is in the episode 711-92 of the visit of Hera and Athene to the battlefield. For the latter passage it is sufficient to refer to Robert, p. 189 f.

E 683 Σαρπηδῶν Διὸς νιός, ἐπος δ' ὀλοφυδνὸν ἔειπε.

That the combat of Sarpedon the Lycian and Tlepolemos the Heraklid must belong to the latest additions to the Iliad, hardly requires discussion, but reference may be made to the linguistic evidence collected by Bechtel, pp. 189, 304. The digamma is

neglected in  $\tau'$  ἔλθεται (481) in a passage intended to lead up to this episode, cf. Robert, p. 186.<sup>1</sup>

- \* Z 90 πέπλον δὲ οἱ δοκέει .....
- \* 101 ..... οὐδέ τίς οἱ δίνεται μένος ἴσοφαρίζειν.
- \* 289 ἐνθ' ἔσαν οἱ πέπλοι παμποίκιλοι, ἔργα γυναικῶν

Further evidence is not required, but cf. Robert, p. 194 f., Bechtel, p. 120.

Z 386 ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πήρογον ἐβη μέγαν Ἰλίου ....  
403 ..... οἷος γὰρ ἐρνέτο Ἰλίου Ἐκτωρ.

From the Ἐκτωρος καὶ Ἀνδρομάχης ὄμιλία (365-502). Even when 367 is emended οὐ γάρ [τ'] Φοῖδα, and μάλιστα δὲ ἐμοὶ is accepted in 493 on the strength of Ox. Pap. 445, there still remains Ἰλίου ἴφι (478) as proof of the loss of the digamma which harmonizes well with the other evidence of later date adduced by Robert, p. 198, and Bechtel, p. 111.

- \* H 21 Περγάμου ἐκκατιδόνι .....
- 108 δεξιτερῆς ἔλε χειρός, ἐπος τ' ἐφατ(ο) ....
- \* 162 ὀρτο πολὺ πρώτος μὲν ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων
- 277 ..... σκῆπτρα σχέθον, εἰπέ τε μῆθον.

None of the examples come from the battle of Hector and Aias, but all are in the material added to turn this battle into a formal duel, cf. Robert, p. 169 ff. From the same part come also ὅφρ' εἴπω (68), ὅφρα τις ὡδ' εἴπησιν (300); for other linguistic evidence of later date, cf. Bechtel, p. 16 f.

H 467 νῆες δὲ ἐκ Δῆμνοι παρέστασαν οἰνον ἀγονούσαι

For the loss of the digamma cf. γίνεται' Ἰλίου (345), ὅφρ' εἴπω (369), καὶ ἔτ' οἰκοθεν (364 = 391), καὶ δὲ τόδ' εἰπέμεναι (375); and for other evidence of the age of H 313-482, cf. Robert, p. 168 f., Bechtel, pp. 126, 165.

- \* Θ 94 ..... κακὸς ὡς ἐν ὄμιλῳ
- \* 133 βροντήσας δὲ ἄρα δεινὸν .....
- \* 143 ..... Διδεῖς νόον εἰρήσσαιτο
- \* 233 ..... ἐκατόν τε διηκοσίων τε .....
- \* 271 ..... πάτες ὡς ὑπὸ μητέρα .....

The late date of the Κόλος μάχη Θ 1-484 is established both by its contents, cf. Robert, p. 164 ff., and by its language, cf. Bechtel,

<sup>1</sup> Solmsen, p. 250, suggests that this form is the later Ionic continuation of ἔξελθεται; but this is merely exchanging one evidence of late date for another.

p. 24. The loss of the initial digamma is seen in *μοι ἔωθεν* (408=422).

\* I 73 ..... πόλεσιν γάρ ἀνάσσεις

Reported as the reading of Aristarchus for the *πολέεσσι δ'* *ἀνάσσεις* of our manuscripts. The introduction to the Embassy is not older than the Embassy itself to which we are now coming.

I 123=265 ..... ἑείκοσι, δώδεκα .....

142 ..... τίσω δέ μιν ἵσον Ὁρέστη

\* 180 δενδίλλων ἐς ἔκαστον .....

203 ..... ἐντυνον ἐκάστῳ

\* 374 ..... οὐδὲ μὲν ἔργον

383 ..... εἰσί, διηκόσιοι δ' ἀν' ἔκάστας (ἀν' Φεκάστας?)

\* 392 ..... ἐπέοικε .....

396 ..... πτολιεθρα ρύνονται

\* 548 ..... δέρματι λαχνήνετι

Aristarchus also read in 128=270 γυναῖκας ἀμύμονας ἔργ' εἰδνίας. Of elision we have the following examples: ἔργ' εἰδνίας (128=270), πλησάμενος δ' οἴνοιο (224), δαιτὸς ἐπηράτου ἔργα (228), ἐξαπάφοιτ' ἐπέεσσι (376), δεκάκις τε καὶ εἰκοσάκις (379), παράρρητοι τ' ἐπέεσσι (526), πόλλ' ἔρδεσκε (540), τάδ' εἰπέμεν (688); note also ἔρεξα (453), ἔρεξεν (647). For other evidence cf. Bechtel, pp. 8, 62, 90 f., 148, 164.

K 134 (=B 219) ..... ἐπενήνοθε λάχνη

\* 146 ..... ἐπέοικε

503 ..... δ τι κίντατον ἔρδοι.

For the loss of the digamma in the Doloneia cf. θεὸς δ' ὁς (33), ἔργα δ' ἔρεξ(ε) (51), ἥλυθ' ιωή (139), διασκοπιάσθαι ἔκαστα (388), δίειπε (425), τὴν νύκτ' Οἰνεῖδαο πάϊς (497); for the other evidence cf. Bechtel, p. 3.

\* Δ 502 ..... μέρμερα ρέζων

The episode of the wounding of Machaon (499-520) contains also αὐτίκα δ' ὁν δχέων (517). It is the introduction to the close of the book (597-848) in which occur:

\* Δ 673, 686, 698 .... ἐν Ἡλιδι .....

838 ..... τι ρέξομεν .....

Loss of the digamma is seen in ὀπότ' Ἡλείοισι (671), ἥδε καὶ ἔργων (703), ἀμφίσταντο δὴ ἀστυ (733), ταῦτ' εἴποις (791). Corroborative evidence in Bechtel, pp. 98, 209.

M 367 ..... ὀτρίνετον ίφι μάχεσθαι

464 ..... τὸν ἐεστο περὶ χροῖ, δοιὰ δὲ χερσὶ

That the *Τειχομαχία* is a unit has been shown by Robert, p. 149 ff., while for its language reference to Bechtel, pp. 30 f., 161 f. will suffice. The loss of the digamma is shown in  $\ddot{\alpha}\delta'$  *εἰπη* (317), *τιν'* *ἴδοιτο* (333),  $\delta\acute{e}\tau\iota\iota\epsilon\pi\gamma\omega\eta$  (412), even if *τε καὶ ὁ* (162) be explained with Bechtel as containing the continuation of *εἰFώ*.

\* N 137 ..... δλοοίτροχος ὅς .....  
155 ὅς εἰπάν *διτρυνε* μένος καὶ *θυμὸν* ἐκάστον.

That the opening of the thirteenth book as far as line 155, with the exception of some embedded fragments of older poetry, is late, has been shown by Robert, p. 123, and is supported by Bechtel's analysis of the language, cf. pp. 191, 201, 25, 105. Loss of the digamma is seen in *μετεισάμενος* (90), which cannot be explained by apocope.

N 277 f. *ἐξ λόχον*, *ἐνθα μάλιστ'* *ἀρετὴ* διαιδεται *ἀνδρῶν*—  
*ἐνθ' ὁ τε δειλὸς ἀνήρ*, *ὅς τ' ἀλκιμος* *ἐξεφαάνθη*.

The second line is rightly pronounced by Leaf a gloss and a terribly flat one on the preceding line; it is sufficiently characterized by *δειλός* as a dissyllable, cf. Bechtel, p. 150, and in the sense of *cowardly*. It is therefore hardly necessary to call attention to the fact that N 210-401 is a later stratum, cf. Robert, p. 110, Bechtel, p. 11.

N 349 ..... 'Αχαιικὸν 'Ιλιόθι πρό

In the same stratum and furthermore in the generally condemned passage N 345-60, of which Leaf says that there is "no other case of such a lengthy and superfluous recapitulation in Homer".

Ξ 346 ..... *Κρόνον πάις ἦν παράκοιτιν*.

One who would interpret this as *πάις Fήν* must emend *λωτόν θ'* *έρσηεντα* (348), and then reckon with *αἴμ' ἐμέων* (O 11) in the sequel. For the language of the *Διὸς ἀπάτη* Ξ 153-362 cf. Bechtel, pp. 78, 204.

\* O 209 *δππότ'* *ἀν* *ἰσδμορον* .....

The example itself involves the Ionic particle *ἀν* and refers back to the story of the partition of the world, in which *δέδασται* *ἐκαστος* (189) occurs. For proof that O 1-404 is in the main late, cf. Robert, p. 135 ff.

O 288 ..... *Ἐλπετο* *θυμὸν* *ἐκάστον*

In the same stratum and more particularly in the Thoas episode O 281-305, on which cf. Bechtel, pp. 185, 274. It presup-

poses the restoration of Hector by Apollo, so that I may cite as evidence of the loss of the digamma *φωνήσασ' ἔπεια* (145), *ἄκ' ἐπέεσσι* (156).

O 500=514 ὡς εἰπὸν ὀτρυνε μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἔκαστον  
505 ..... ἦν πατρίδα γαῖαν ἔκαστος

The section O 484-559 contains also *ἔτι δ' ἀπέτο* (539); for its age cf. Robert, p. 141, Bechtel, p. 31.

II 210 ὡς εἰπὸν ὀτρυνε μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἔκαστον.

On account of *ῆης* (208) the loss of digamma is inferred by Solmsen, p. 254, anm. 1; cf. also Robert, p. 96, Bechtel, p. 165.

\* II 232 οὐρανὸν εἰσανιδῶν .....

Included here as occurring in a compound; on the age of the digression II 218-256 which includes three iteratives, cf. Robert, p. 96.

II 464 ..... Σαρπηδόνος ἦν ἀνάκτος  
481 .... ἐνθ' ἄρα τε φρένες ἔρχαται .....

\* 643 ὥρη ἐν εἰαρινῇ .....

On the Sarpedon episode II 419-683 cf. Robert, p. 100 f., p. 395, Bechtel, pp. 5, 204, which afford sufficient evidence to reject the various emendations, cf. Solmsen, p. 160, which have been suggested to remove cases of elision: *ἄρματ' ἀνάκτων* (507), *οὐδ' οὐ* (522), *σύ πέρ μοι ἄναξ* (523), *θεὸς δ' ὁς* (605).

P 41 ἀλλ' οὐ μὰν ἔτι δηρόν .....

\* 70 ἐνθα κε ῥεῖα .....

\* 90 ὥχθησας δ' ἄρα εἴπε πρὸς δν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν.

On P 1-131 cf. Robert, p. 78 f., and for its instances of contraction Bechtel, p. 147 f., p. 172, p. 193; the loss of the digamma is evident in *δ' θ' ἀλις* (54).

P 327 Αἰνεῖα πῶς ἀν καὶ ὑπὲρ θεὸν εἰρίσσασθε  
\* 354 ..... σάκεσσι γὰρ ἔρχατο πάντῃ

On the section P 319-365 cf. Robert, p. 82; loss of the digamma in *δ' ἐκατηβόλον* (333).

P 635=713 .... δπως τὸν νεκρὸν ἔρνσσομεν ....  
645 ..... ἀλλὰ σὺ βῆσαι .....

On the close of the battle over Patroklos (P 543-761), cf. Robert, p. 85, and Bechtel, p. 50; loss of the digamma is clear from *ἐπιβρέμει* *ἴς* (739).

\* Σ 258 τόφρα δὲ βητέροι .....

274 ..... σθένος ἔξομεν, ἀστν δὲ πίργοι

\* 367 ..... κακὰ βάψαι

The section 2 239-368 is preparatory for the 'Οπλοποιία, cf. Robert, p. 92. Its first part, the bivouac of the Trojans (243-314) contains two of our examples and also ἀφίξεται Ἱλιον (270), τ' ἀλσαι (294), cf. also Bechtel, p. 31. The last example is from the conversation of Zeus and Hera (356-368), for which reference to Leaf will suffice.

\* Σ 415 ..... καὶ στήθεα λαχνήντα

In the 'Οπλοποιία proper; for the language of this section cf. Bechtel, p. 119, and note θ' ἀλικας (401).

\* Σ 545 ..... δέπας μελιηδέος οίνον

In the description of Achilles' shield (481-608). The section contains also δ' ἵεσθην (501), οἴοντ' εἰλυμένοι (522). Bechtel's decision (p. 114) to leave this unchanged is far better than Solmsen's (p. 237) "ohne weiteres οἴον".

T 4 εὑρε δὲ Πατρόκλῳ περικείμενον δὲν φίλον νιόν

The bringing of the arms to Achilles (T 3-39) cannot be older than the 'Οπλοποιία.

\* T 75 μῆνιν ἀπειπόντος .....

124 ..... οὐ οἱ ἀνεκὲς ἀναστέμεν .....

244 ..... ἐείκοσι, δώδεκα .....

(= I 123)  
332 ..... καὶ οἱ δεῖξεις ἵκαστα

The Μήνιδος ἀπόρρησις cannot be older than the Πρεσβεία; it contains δῆρ' εἴπω (102) besides ἔπειτ' ίκελη (282), εἰδον (292), κήδε' ἐκάστη (302) in the lament of Briseis (282-303). Even if the latter portion be set aside, the evidence for late date is sufficient, cf. Bechtel, p. 9 f.

\* Υ 67 ..... Ποσειδάνως ἀνακτος

186 ..... χαλεπῶς δέ σ' ἔολπα τὸ βέξειν

\* 195 ἀλλ' οὐ νῦν ΣΕΡΤΕΣΘΑΙ .....

214 ..... πολλοὶ δέ μιν ἀνδρες ίσασιν (= Z 151)

\* 282 ..... καὶ δ' ἄχος οἱ χύτο .....

\* 311 ..... ἡ κέν μιν ἐρύσσεαι .....

\* 343 ὀχθῆσας δ' ἄρα εἴπε πρὸς δὲν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν.

The examples are from the council of the gods and the Aineias episode, on which cf. Robert, p. 233, p. 224 ff. Elision is seen in 186 (quoted above) and in δ' εἰσάμενος (224); for other evidence of the date of the language cf. Bechtel, pp. 162, 48.

Υ 371 f. ..... καὶ εἰ πυρὶ χείρας ἔοικεν

εἰ πυρὶ χείρας ἔοικε .....

\* 450 ..... νῦν αὐτές ΣΕΡΤΕΑΤΟ .....

On the close of γ cf. Bechtel, p. 192; the only case of elision is the easily emended  $\mu'$  ἐπέεσσι (431), but it must be remembered that parts of the next two books must also be included in forming our estimate.

- \* Φ 53 ὁχθῆσας δ' ἄρα εἰπε πρὸς δν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν
- \* ..... δτ' ἐξ Ἰλιον εἰλήλουθα
- \* 128 ..... εἰς δ κεν δστν κιχήσομεν Ἰλιον ἱρῆς

From the Lykaon episode Φ 1-16, 34-138, on which cf. Bechtel, p. 206; neglect of the digamma is seen in  $\mu$ εγάλ' ἵαχον (10).

- \* Φ 156 .. δτ' ἐξ Ἰλιον εἰλήλουθα
- 194 ..... Ἀχελάιος ἴσοφαρίζει
- \* 214 ..... αλουλα βέζεις
- \* 217 ..... μέρμερα βέζει

From the Asteropaios episode Φ 139-227, which is clearly younger than the Ὀπλοποιία, cf. Robert, p. 230 f., and gives other slight evidence of its date in βαθέις (213), παῖς (216), cf. Bechtel, p. 225.

- Φ 236=344 .... οἱ δά κατ' αὐτὸν ἄλις ἔσαν ....
- \* 379 ..... οὐ γὰρ ἔουκεν
- 391 ἐνθ' οἱ γ' οὐκέτι δηρόν ....
- 411 ..... δτι μοι μένος ἴσοφαρίζεις<sup>1</sup>
- \* 509 τίς νύ σε ΤΟΙΑΔΕΡΕΞΕ ....

The examples are from the Battle with the Skamander and the Θεομαχία, Φ 228-514; for the analysis of which, cf. Robert, p. 231 ff., and for its language, Bechtel, pp. 56, 32. Loss of digamma is clearly shown by καίετο δ' ἵς (356), after which it is unnecessary to emend πτελέαι τε καὶ λτεία (350), ἐπιστώσαντ' ἐπέεσσι (286), and even the variant δύνατ' ἴσοφαρίζειν (357) has some claim to consideration.

- \* Φ 552 ὁχθῆσας δ' ἄρα εἰπε πρὸς δν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν. = X 98
- 588 Ἰλιον εἰρνόμεσθα .....
- \* X 23 δε δά τε βέια θέγοι .....
- \* 61 ..... ἐπιδόντα
- \* 71 ..... ἐπέοικεν
- 259 ..... δε δὲ σὺ βέζειν

The Ἐκτόρος ἀνάρτησις, Φ 515-X 394, contains two certain instances of the loss of digamma  $\mu$ άλ' ἰδλπας (Φ 583), χέουσ' ἐπεα (X 81); its language is sufficiently characterized by the evidence collected by Bechtel, pp. 9, 162.

- \* X 407 ..... ἐσιδόνα
- 450 δεῦτε, δνω μοι ἐπεσθον ἰδωμ' δτιν' ἔργα τέτυκται

<sup>1</sup>Var. lect. ἀντιφερίζεις which in 488 is the better attested reading.

No one can think of claiming a greater age for the close of the book, and so it is unnecessary to emend the close of 450, while Bechtel's (p. 90) conjecture ἐμεῖ ἔπος (454) wins greater probability, cf. also Bechtel, p. 270.

Ψ	49	..... δτρυννον, ἀναξ .....	
	55	..... ἐφοπλίσσαντες ἔκαστοι	
*	288	..... πρῶτος μὲν ἀναξ .....	(cf. H 162)
	320	..... ἐπὶ πολλὸν ἐλίσσεται .....	
	370	..... θυμὸς ἔκαστον	
	393	..... ἐπὶ γαῖαν ἐλινθη	
*	434	..... αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐκών .....	
*	494	..... τοιαῦτά γε φέζοι	
*	585	..... μὴ μὲν ἐκών .....	
	741	..... τετνυμένον· ἔξ .....	
	748	..... ἀέθλιον οὐ ἐτάροι	
*	865	..... μέγυρε γάρ οἱ .....	

A closer analysis of the parts of this book is unnecessary for our purpose. The digamma is lost in δεῦρ' ἔρύσας (21), κάλ' ἐικνία (66), τίππε μοι ἡθεῖη (94), καὶ μοι ἔκαστα (107), ἥργ' εἰδυῖαν (263), τέρμαθ' ἐιισσέμεν (309), πάντεσσ' ἔργοισι (671), δ' ἵσα (736), θμρ' ἔριώ (787). The language is analyzed by Bechtel, pp. 117, 18, 129, 55, 293, 299, 175.<sup>1</sup>

Ω	I	..... θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας ἔκαστοι
*	53	..... νεμεσοθῶμέν οἱ ἡμεῖς
*	67	..... οἱ ἐν Ἰλίῳ εἰσίν
*	72	..... ἡ γάρ οἱ αἰεὶ
*	271	..... ἐνξέστω ἐπὶ βημά
*	307	..... εἰσανθέν .....
*	337	..... ὡς μήτ' ἀρ τις ιδῃ
	449	..... ποίησαν ἀνακτί
	452	..... ποίησαν ἀνακτί
	462	..... πάλιν εἰσομαι .....
	510	..... προπάροιθε ποδῶν Ἀχιλῆος ἐλυσθεῖς
*	595	..... ἐπέοικεν

The loss of the digamma is seen in τρὶς δ' ἔρύσας (16), τρὶς δ' ἔκάτερθεν (273), ἥλθ' Ἐκάβη (283), ἐπὶ τ' Ἀπητας (491), αὐθ' Ἐκάβη (747). Other evidence in abundance may be found in Bechtel, p. ix., p. 42 f.

In the Iliad there are something over two hundred instances which may be claimed to show 'neglect of position' before digamma. Of these we have now found over 160 in parts of the

<sup>1</sup> The gladiatorial combat 798-825 is of interest as showing how successful imitation could be for a short time. It contains no contracted forms, nor any offences against the digamma.

poem for which we must assume composition at a time when initial digamma was no longer pronounced. Over half of these examples furthermore refute themselves, for in them, had the digamma been pronounced, we must have found lengthening as the "behandlungsweise des wortinlauts". In view of these facts we may proceed with the examination of the remaining passages in the conviction that there is a presumption of late date against a passage which shows 'neglect of position' before digamma.

II 275 ὡς εἰπὼν ὀτρυνε μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἐκάστον.

At the close of Patroklos' speech (269-274), a cento in which only the words ὡς ἀν Πηλειδην τιμῆσομεν are original. That we have no early poetry here is obvious, cf. Robert, p. 97.

O 667 the same formula.

The following lines were questioned in antiquity and Leaf says 'the only doubt is whether the athetesis should not extend to Nestor's speech as well'. Linguistically it is characterized by a plural *k*-perfect, found otherwise only in the Embassy.<sup>1</sup> The formula may be left unemended in such surroundings. Compare also Robert, p. 143.

O 639 Κοπρῆος φίλον νιόν, δις Εύρυσθῆος ἀνακτος

To the variant *άειθλων*, preferred by Leaf to save the digamma, I attach no importance. Robert, p. 144, has shown that the account of Periphetes' parentage 639-644 is an interpolation. The Heracles myth and the iterative *οἴχνεσκε* (640) harmonize with the loss of the digamma.

\* O 626 ..... ἀνέμοιο δὲ δεινὸς ἄγρη

In the simile 624-629, of which we have here three in succession. We must follow Robert, p. 145, in regarding this line as evidence of the date of the simile.

O 453 κείν' δχεα κροτέοντες. ἀναξ δ' ἐνόησε τάχιστα

The account of the slaying of Kleitos, O 444-457, caused difficulty to the Alexandrian critics. We may note in the first place that he is the charioteer of Polydamas, the Ionic counterpart of Helenos (cf. Robert, p. 388 f.), and secondly that there could be no driving of chariots in the crowded battle about the ships. Robert's conclusion (p. 141) that the lines have supplanted some other exploit of Teucer's seems to me necessary. The only other

<sup>1</sup> Such evidence is valid in spite of Scott's article, *Classical Philology*, VI. 159 ff.

linguistic evidence against the lines is dissyllabic *βιλεα* (444), which has been emended to *βελος*. Bechtel—who accepts Solmsen's theory—endorses the emendation, p. 47, but after seeing the company in which 'neglected position' elsewhere appears the plural should be allowed to stand.

\* Ε 437 ἐζόμενος δ' ἐπὶ γοῦνα κελαινεθὲς αἰμ' ἀπέμεσσεν  
472 ἀξιος; οὐ μέν μοι κακὸς εἰδεται οὐδὲ κακῶν ἔξ

The first line would itself condemn this section were it not for the ease with which it can be emended. Roberthas shown, however, p. 134, that with line 425 there is a sudden shift from Mycenaean to Ionic weapons, and with the latter appear heroes who figure prominently only in the younger strata of the poem. The language of ll. 440-507 has been analyzed by Bechtel, p. 275, with the result that *οἰω* (454) is the only certain indication of later date, but that this is sufficient. With his view of the age of the passage we must agree and accept the two cases of 'neglected position' as corroborative evidence.

N 191 ..... ἀλλ' οὐ πη χροδες εἰσατο ....  
204 ἡκε δέ μν σφαιρηδὸν ἐλιξάμενος δι' ὀμίλον

The first line is included merely for the sake of completeness, as Zenodotos' reading *χρώς* is clearly to be preferred. In N 182-205 the weapons are Ionic, and we must follow Robert, p. 110, in regarding the 'neglected position' as evidence of late date.

N 163 .... σχέθ' ἀπὸ ξο δεῖσε δὲ θυμῷ

Robert, p. 109, has shown that N 162b-164a is an interpolation, describing an Ionic parry made with a Mycenaean shield after the opponent's spear had already broken.

\* Λ 166 οι δὲ παρ' Ἰλον σῆμα

If we read *πὰρ Φίλον σῆμα* we must demand lengthening as the "behandlungsweise des wortinlauts", we are therefore forced to recognize the absence of the digamma, and to regard 166-9 as an "ionische Erweiterung" with Robert, p. 158.

Θ 512 ..... ἐπιβαίεν ἐκηλοι  
535 αἴρουν ἦν .....

Robert, p. 132, has shown how much Hector's speech gains by the excision of 512-516, and by stopping with 527. Its close is

pretty generally condemned, and an additional reason in the faulty use of *aσπιον* may be found in AJPh. xxiii., p. 434.<sup>1</sup>

- \* Δ 508 Περγάμον ἐκκατιδόν .....
- \* 516 ..... θθι μεθιέντας ίδοιτο.

The examples prove of themselves the absence of the digamma. They stand in a short passage 507-516 in which Apollo and Athene interfere with the battle causelessly and ineffectively. Robert, p. 176 f., regards the interpolation as extending back as far as 473, but in my opinion on insufficient grounds. There are three grounds of suspicion: *αιολοθάρηξ* (489) which may, however, be merely a substitution for *αιολομίτρης*; the neglect of the digamma in *έτέρωσ' ἐρύνοντα* (492), for which we may read *έτέρωσε* *Ἐρύνοντα* with Schulze, Q. E., p. 317; and the appearance of iron in the close of the simile 485-7, which offers other difficulties (cf. Leaf) and may well be dispensed with. On the other hand the helmet of Demokoon is presumably if not conclusively Mycenaean, and the Greek warriors distinguish themselves in the order to be expected in the first Iliad. First blood is given to Antilochus as the youngest member of the expedition, then Aias and Odysseus slay their men. Upon line 506 can follow immediately line 517 so that we gain a larger connected portion of the first Iliad, in which a later poet has thrust an account of supernatural interference more in accord with the fifth book than with the close of the fourth.<sup>2</sup>

- \* B 802 ..... ὁδε δὲ φέξαι

A word group which itself proves the loss of the digamma. The close of the Iris-Polites' speech, B 802-6, is intended to pave the way for the Catalogue of the Trojans. Reference to Robert, p. 221, Bechtel, p. 174, will suffice.

- B 518 νίέες 'Ιφίτοο .....
- 626 νήσων αἱ ναίοντι πέρην ἀλός, Ἡλιδος ἀντα
- \* 665 ..... ἀπειλησαν γάρ οἱ ἀλλοι
- \* 719 ..... ἐν ἐκάστη .....

<sup>1</sup> My tendency to follow Croiset in the interpretation of Σ 269 was a mistake. The *Ἐκτροπος ἀναίρεσις* begins four lines later than Robert indicates, p. 503, and the speech of Polydamas is made before sunset.

<sup>2</sup> In the arrangement of the following fragments I should also differ from Robert, for closely after this portion I would place the Aineias-Menelaos-Antilochos episode. Then when Aineias retreats he calls for Hector, and the first meeting of the latter with Aias occurs.

720 .... τόξων ἐν εἰδότες ίφι μάχεσθαι  
 743 .... ὅτε φῆρας ἐτίσατο λαχνήεντας  
 750 οἱ περὶ Δωδώνην δυσχείμερον οἰκί έθεντο,  
 751 οἱ τ' ἀμφ' ίμερτὸν Τιταρήσιον ἔργ' ἐνέμοντο.

Both Robert, p. 220, and Bechtel, pp. 164, 170, 233, summarily reject the Catalogue of the Ships; on the other hand Solmsen, Rh. M. liii. 146 f., maintains that it is old. That the view of the latter scholar is correct, at least as far as the kernel of the Catalogue is concerned, should in my opinion be conceded. Granting this, however, it is obvious that the Catalogue has been expanded, as it provides for heroes who figure only in the latest parts of the poem. Presumably the examples of 'neglected position' belong to these later additions, and there is something to be said in support of this presumption. Line 626 is a gloss with faulty geography on 'Εχινάων θ' ιεράων (625). Line 665 might also be accented *γὰρ οἱ ἄλλοι*; in either case the language would be late, but that is only to be expected in a section dealing with Tlepolemos. The word group in line 719 carries its own conviction, and with it line 720 must fall. Line 743 deals with the Lapithae myth. Lines 750-1 are in the section on the troops of Gouneus, who does not reappear in the Iliad, but was known in the Nostoi, cf. Robert, p. 573. Finally line 518 is the filling out of the family tree of Schedios; emendation is easy, but unnecessary.<sup>1</sup>

B 435 μηκέτι νῦν δὴ ταῦτα λεγόμεθα, μηδ' ἐτι δηρόν

The army's meal and the sacrifice offered by the kings, B 399-440, delay the action of the poem, and must be considered, with Robert, p. 220, as an interpolation. Linguistic evidence is *ἄλλος*

<sup>1</sup> The other evidences of late date are also confined to parts of the Catalogue which may be regarded as additions. Short datives are confined to *τοῖς δέ* (516, 524, 733, 747) in the summary statements of the numbers of the ships; the systematic carrying out of this is probably late, and a formula beginning *τῷ δέ* has been pluralized; here also occurs *όγδοοντα* (568, 652). Contraction is found *Μηκιστέως*, *ῆγετο* in the lines dealing with Euryalos (565-568) and with Machaon *ῆγεισθην* (731); elsewhere only *καλεῖντο* (684) in a line which could well be spared, and in *ῆγετο* (638) where a line like 645 has been altered to introduce 'Ανδραιμονος νέος. *σφέας* (704) is a doubtful form, but if the assembling of the fleet at Aulis was originally described in the Catalogue lines 700-4 are a later addition. The iteratives occur only 539, 758 and 770; on the last cf. Schulze, Q. E., p. 349, while *ἄν* is found only in the story of Thamyris (597).

δ' ἀλλῳ ἔρεξε (400), where emendation is unnecessary, the iterative in 404, λεγώμεθα = *converse*, and Ἡφαιστος = *fire* (426.)

A 203 ἡ ἵνα ὑβριν ἰδεῖς

For the difficulties connected with this short speech, cf. Leaf, Robert, p. 214, Bechtel, p. vii. The only doubt is whether the athetesis should begin with line 201 or line 203.

The outcome of our examination so far has been that about 190 of the alleged cases of 'neglected position' stand in portions of the poem for which we are justified in assuming composition at a time when the digamma was no longer actually spoken. When these are set aside there remain but seventeen examples to which such an explanation cannot apply:

A 21	ἀζόμενοι Διὸς υἱὸν ἐκηβόλον Ἀπόλλωνα
*	106 ..... οὐ πά ποτέ μοι τὸ κρήγνον εἰπας
*	126 λαοὺς δ' οὐκ ἐπέοικε .....
*	147 ..... λεπὰ ἥξας
*	216 ..... ἐπος εἰρίσσασθαι
*	230 ..... δε τις σέθεν ἀντίον εἰπυ
*	294 εἰ δὴ σοὶ πᾶν ἔργον ὑπείξομαι .....
*	B 471 ὥρη ἐν εἰαρινῇ .....
Z	72=Δ 291 ὡς εἰπὼν ὑτρούνε μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἐκάστον
*	Δ 363 ..... νῦν αὐτέ ΣΕΡΥΣΑΤΟ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων
*	Δ 403=Σ 5 ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα εἰπε πρὸς δὺν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν
*	N 555 Νέστορος υἱὸν ἔρντο .....
*	Π 735 μάρμαρον ὀκριβεύτα, τόν οἱ περὶ χεὶρ ἐκάλυψεν
*	P 518 ἡ δ' οὐκ ἔγχος ἔρντο .....
Τ	422 ὅηδον ἐκὰς στρωφᾶσθαι .....

It might fairly be questioned whether these examples as they stand do not constitute too slender a basis for the erection of Solmsen's theory. However twelve of the examples are word groups demanding lengthening as the "behandlungsweise des wortinlauts". For them another explanation is imperative and they must carry the remaining five examples with them.

In the first place four of the examples are of *ἔρυμαι* *protect*, and in view of their age I consider it necessary to abandon definitely the attempt to connect this verb with Sanskrit *varūtar*, and look upon its relationship to Latin *servare* as definitely established; for the opposite view and the literature of the question, cf. Solmsen, p. 245 ff.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Similarly on account of the age of Π 46 ὡς φάτο λισσόμενος, 47 καὶ κῆρα λιτέσθαι we must deny an initial digamma to *λισσομαι*.

For the other passages acceptable emendations have long since been proposed, which it is needless to repeat here.<sup>1</sup> I will call attention to the fact that they furnish instances of lengthening in word groups in the third thesis  $\pi\rho\delta\varsigma$  Φὸν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν; ὅν Φοι περὶ χεὶρ ἐκάλυψεν. For the absence of such cases Solmsen's theory had no explanation to offer, while Danielsson had been led theoretically to the assumption that they had been removed in the course of the modernization of the poems. It is also noteworthy that other examples B 471, Z 72, A 403 had been used by poets who did not pronounce the digamma. The Iliad therefore must have once contained two versions of these lines, and the assimilation of the older to the later form is only what was to be expected. These include the two cases in which it is necessary to depart farthest from the traditional text; elsewhere we have merely the substitution of forms which stop a hiatus for readings which seemed to leave an objectionable one. Corruption to this extent seems to me most probable in view of the vicissitudes the text is known to have undergone.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA.

<sup>1</sup> An exception might be made for A 106 which contains a suspicious use of the article. The line may be a later addition, Agamemnon beginning his speech with the abruptness which is in evidence in the later speeches of the council.

[*To be continued.*]

### III.—ON THE USE OF *OTAN* WITH CAUSAL IMPLICATION.

The object of this paper is to show that the conjunction *ὅταν* in its normal combination with a verb in the subjunctive mood not infrequently bears a causal signification varying in strength according to the circumstances, and that in such cases the temporal meaning is more or less evanescent, and sometimes entirely disappears. With the use of the conjunction where the verb refers to future time (Goodwin, § 529; Kuehner-Gerth, § 567, 3) I am not at present concerned. It is rather my purpose to establish that the classification which sums up the other occurrences of the construction as necessarily expressing 'indefinite frequency' (Goodwin, § 532; Kuehner-Gerth, § 567, 4) is incomplete; and that a rigorous insistence on its universal applicability has vitiated the interpretation of numerous passages.

My attention was originally directed to this question by the impossibility of bringing Eur. Ion 743 f. within the compass of the ordinary rule: ΚΡ. βάκτρῳ δ' ἐρείδον περιφερῆ στίβον χθονός. ΠΑ. καὶ τοῦτο τυφλόν, ὅταν ἐγὼ βλέπω βραχύ. The meaning of *περιφερῆ* is disputed, but there can be no doubt as to the general drift: Cr. 'Guide yourself by your staff'... Paed. 'That is a blind guide, *now that* my sight is dim.' The editors either ignore the difficulty, or, recognising that *ὅταν* must be causal, fail to perceive that they are defending an anomaly. Now consider Thuc. I. 141 μάχῃ μὲν γάρ μιᾶ πρὸς ἄπαντας Ἐλληνας δυνατοὶ Πελοποννήσιοι καὶ οἱ ξύμμαχοι ἀντισχέιν, πολεμεῖν δὲ μὴ πρὸς ὅμοιαν ἀντιπαρασκευὴν ἀδύνατοι, ὅταν μήτε βουλευτηρίῳ ἐνὶ χρώμενοι παραχρῆμά τι δέξεσθαι ἐπιτελῶσι, πάντες τε Ισόφηφοι ὅντες καὶ οὐχ ὁμόφυλοι τὸ ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν ἔκαστος σπεύδῃ. The Peloponnesians and their allies cannot carry on a war successfully, *because*, being an aggregation of independent units, they fail in common initiative. How can *ὅταν* be translated otherwise than by some phrase which preserves the causal nexus? The translators who are free from grammatical shackles do not hesitate to express it, as may be seen (ex. gr.) from the versions of Bloomfield and Dale. Mr. Marchant, following Krueger, Poppo-Stahl,

Classen-Steup and Forbes, renders 'so long as'; but that is really an equivoque, which affects to preserve the temporal meaning, while in accordance with English idiom it approximates to 'provided that'. If *όταν* is admitted to possess the same flexibility, *cadit quaestio*. Shilleto, with characteristic clearness of vision, maintained that there was a blending of the particular with the general: 'The Peloponnesians are unable . . ., i. e. men are unable when . . .'. And he translated the passage in the Ion, 'when one like me is short-sighted'. But why should we so torture the language, 'when' (or 'so long as') nothing is more certain than the assumption of a causal bearing by temporal conjunctions in various languages? The progress of the English *when* from time to cause is illustrated by Prof. W. G. Hale in his *Cum-Constructs*, at p. 155. It is the merest prejudice to refuse to *όταν* a development which is freely conceded to *ἐπει* and *ότε*. Whether the time-force of *όταν* is entirely lost in Thucydides I am not concerned to argue; but it is strongly maintained that the sentence has nothing in common with the clause of general assumption, which monopolizes the attention of the grammarians.

Before proceeding with the general body of evidence, I wish to call attention to Soph. Ai. 134 ff. Τελαμώνε παῖ . . . σὲ μὲν εὐ πράσσοντ' ἐπιχαίρω· | σὲ δὲ ὅταν πληγὴ Διὸς ἡ ζαμεῆς | λόγος ἐκ Δαναῶν κακόθρους ἐπιβῆ, | μέγαν δκνον ἔχω καὶ πεφόβημαι· | πτηνῆς ὡς δύμα πελεῖας, where I believe that grammatical preconception has blinded the critics to the true sequence of thought. I interpret thus: 'As I rejoice ever at your good fortune, so *now that* you are assailed either by a stroke of Zeus or an envious slander, I am scared. *For* the story we have heard, etc.' (141). The facts, in the view of the Salaminians, are capable of two explanations only: either 1) Ajax is divinely distraught, or 2) he has been slandered. It is only by degrees that the truth of the former—and fatal—alternative is forced upon the chorus. So in 186: 'It may be θεῖα νόσος,—but God forbid; but if, on the other hand, the story is false, up and repel it.' At last, after hearing the account of Tecmessa, they are obliged sorrowfully to admit the truth: δέδοικα μὴ καθεοῦ | πληγή τις ἦκη (278). The current view treats *όταν* . . . *ἐπιβῆ* as a clause of general assumption: 'Whenever a stroke from Zeus . . . assails you, I am always in fear.' Paley alone betrays his uneasiness by the curious remark, 'The subjunctive implies that such a slander may happen again.' But that is not the way in which men express themselves when they find that *for the first time*

they are face to face with a frightful calamity. Or are we to suppose that Ajax was subject to attacks of madness, or has suffered at other times from the malicious plots of his companions? The supposition is neither justified by tradition nor credible in itself. But the weightiest consideration remains to be stated. *πληγὴ Διός*, as Sophocles himself will testify, brings with it destruction, final and crushing: *θεοῦ δὲ πληγὴν οὐχ ὑπερπηδᾶ βροτός* (fr. 876). So in Aesch. Ag. 379 *Διὸς πλαγὰν ἔχονσιν* is the mournful sentence pronounced over the downfall of Troy. How then can we contemplate its recurrence? I hardly think that critics have seriously pondered the results which flow from their adherence to established convention.

We must now proceed to show that there is sufficient support in the extant classical literature to justify the view to which general considerations seem to point in the three cases hitherto discussed. It is common ground that *ὅτε* is frequently causal (Goodwin, § 713; Kuehner-Gerth, § 569); and I suppose it is admitted that the use springs naturally from its employment as a temporal conjunction. Exactly the same thing has occurred with *ὅταν*, which originally expressed merely the temporal iteration of an action. Both are limited to the cause of the *judgment* as opposed to that of the fact, as was pointed out in reference to *ὅτε* by Starkie on Ar. Vesp. 1134. It is important to bear this limitation in mind; for it is comparatively seldom that the effect of *ὅταν* can be bluntly reproduced in English by the rendering 'because'.

We will start with a very simple case,—Eur. Hec. 306 ff. *ἐν τῷδε γάρ κάμνοντιν αἱ πολλαὶ πόλεις, | ὅταν τις ἐσθλὸς καὶ πρόθυμος ὁν ἀνήρ | μηδὲν φέρηται τῶν κακιώνων πλέον.* Here opinions may differ as to the precise value of the temporal conjunction; but it is obviously explanatory of what goes before, and gives the reason for the assertion of *κάμνοντιν*. The lines are exactly parallel to Soph. fr. 74 *ἐνταῦθα μέντοι πάντα τάνθρώπων νοσεῖ, | κακοῖς ὅταν θελωσιν λασθαι κακά.* Observe that in both cases the passage from the clause of general assumption to the qualitative (causal) clause is marked by the introductory pronominal phrase (*ἐν τῷδε, ἐνταῦθα*). There is a different *nuance* in the purely conditional clause of time, as may be seen by contrasting Ant. 580 *φεύγοντι γάρ τοι χοι θρασεῖς, ὅταν πέλας | ηδη τὸν Ἀιδην εἰσορῶσι τοῦ βίου.* This explicative *ὅταν* occurs again in Ar. Vesp. 606 δέ γ' ηδιστον τούτων ἐστὶν πάντων . . . ὅταν οἴκαδ' ἵω τὸν μισθὸν ἔχων, κατ' εἰσελθόνθ' ἀμα πάντες | ἀσπάζωνται κτέ. Cf.

Isocr. 15. 23 δὲ πάντων δεινότατον, ὅταν τις αὐτὸς μὲν κινδυνεύων κατηγορῇ τῶν διαβαλλόντων, ἔτέρῳ δὲ δικάζων μὴ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχῃ γνώμην. And of course the list might be considerably extended. In the following examples the temporal force is vanishing if not already extinct: Lycurg. 142 καὶ γὰρ δεινὸν καὶ σχέτλιον, ὅταν νομίζῃ δεῦν Λεωκράτης ἵσον ἔχειν δὲ φυγάν κτέ. Isocr. 4. 124 (of the Asiatic Greeks) μέγιστον δὲ τῶν κακῶν, ὅταν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς τῆς δουλείας ἀναγκάζωται συστρατεύεσθαι. ib. 128 δὲ πάντων δεινότατον, ὅταν τις ἵδη τοὺς τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἔχειν ἀξιοῦντας (sc. the Spartans) ἐπὶ μὲν τοὺς Ἑλληνας . . . στρατευομένους, πρὸς δὲ τοὺς βαρβάρους . . . συμμαχίαν πεποιημένους. Isocr. 14. 49 δὲ πάντων ἀλγιστον, ὅταν τις ἵδη χωριζομένους ἀπ' ἀλλήλων . . . πολίτας κτέ. With these should be classed Lycurg. 145 οὐ γὰρ μόνον οἱ φεύγοντες κατέρχονται, ὅταν δὲ ἔγκαταλιπὼν τὴν πόλιν . . . ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ . . . ἀναστρέφονται (it is not merely a case of *exiles* returning, but of a traitor living in our midst). [Dem.] 25. 68 δὲ ἀναιδῆς ἐκ τίνος ὀνομάσθη τῶν ἀλλών ἀλλ' ἡ ὅταν τὰ μήτε ὅντα μήτ' ἀν γενόμενα ταῦτα τολμᾶτε λέγειν δι' ἀναισχυντίαν; Isocr. 6. 60 οὐκ ἀξιον διὰ τοῦτο φοβεῖσθαι τοὺς πολεμίους ὅτι πολλοὶ τυγχάνουσιν ὅντες, ἀλλὰ πολὺ μᾶλλον ἐπ' ἐκείνοις θαρρεῖν, ὅταν ὀρῶμεν ἡμᾶς μὲν αὐτοὺς οὔτως ἐνηνοχότας τὰς συμφοράς κτέ. Here again we have the introductory pronoun. For there is no doubt that ἐπ' ἐκείνοις is neuter and looks forward to ὅταν, balancing διὰ τοῦτο ὅτι. The grounds of confidence are not the repetition of the visual acts, but the various things seen. Observe the awkwardness of the idiom, owing to the Greek tendency to throw the substantive into the verb. I have commented on a similar development in Class. Rev. XX 99. Aeschin. 2. 49 ἀμφοτέρων ἔφη θαυμάζειν . . . ὅταν παρέντες τὸν χρόνον . . . ἀποδιατρίβωσι τὴν ὑπερόριον λαλιὰν ἀγαπῶντες ('quod moram facerent').

There is a very clear example of causal ὅτε in Ar. Ves. 1134 ἔπειτα παῖδας χρὴ φυτεύειν καὶ τρέφειν, | δοῦ ὀντοσί με νῦν ἀποπνίξαι βούλεται; Why should we hesitate to apply the same interpretation to the following precisely similar instances of ὅταν? Soph. fr. 81 κούκ οὐδ' ὅτι χρὴ πρὸς ταῦτα λέγειν, | ὅταν οἱ γ' ἀγαθοὶ πρὸς τῶν ἀγενῶν | κατανικῶνται. | ποία πόλις ἀν τάδ' ἐνέγκοι; (so I read and punctuate, but the illustration is equally to the point with Nauck's text.) Phil. 451 ποῦ χρὴ τίθεσθαι ταῦτα, ποῦ δ' αἰνεῖν, ὅταν | τὰ θεῖ' ἐπαινῶν τοὺς θεοὺς εῦρω κακούς; (Jebb in his note renders 'seeing that . . .', Campbell 'since'). Aeschin. 1. 187 τί δ' ὅφελος παιδαγωγοὺς τρέφειν . . . ὅταν οἱ τὴν τῶν νόμων παρακαταθήκην ἔχοντες πρὸς τὰς αἰσχύνας κατακάμπτωνται; Lys. 27. 3 καίτοι τίνα χρὴ ἐλπίδα ἔχειν σωτηρίας, δόπταν ἐν χρήμασιν οὐ . . . σωθῆναι . . . ταῦτα δὲ οὐτοὶ . . . κλέπτωσι; Theophr. *de sensu* 71 (Diels, Vorsokr.<sup>2</sup> 377, 11) καίτοι τό γε βαρὺ καὶ κοῦφον ὅταν διορίζῃ (cum

*definiat, not quoties definit) τοῖς μεγίθεσιν, ἀνίγκη τὰ δπλᾶ πάντα τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχειν ὄρμὴν τῆς φορᾶς.* The passages in Sophocles are parallel in thought, as well as in language, to Theogn. 747 ff. τίς δῆ κεν θροτὸς ἀλλος . . . ἀξοῖς' ἀθανάτους . . . ὅππότε ἀνὴρ ἄδικος καὶ ἀτάσθαλος . . . ὑβρίζῃ πλούτῳ κεκορμένος, οἱ δὲ δίκαιοι | τρύχονται κτέ. The reason for the shift to the indicative does not concern us here, and I do not wish to lay much stress on the example itself, which is ambiguous. But the type of sentence is a link which carries us back to Hom. v. 195 ἀλλὰ θεοὶ δυάσι πολυπλάγκτους ἀνθρώπους, | ὅππότε καὶ βασιλεῦσιν ἐπικλάσωνται δίξυν, and it will perhaps be conceded that Ernesti's rendering of the subordinate clause 'cum etiam regibus decernant atque immittant miseriam' deserves more consideration than it has received from Monro.

It frequently happens that, when the clause introduced by *ὅταν* is in the nature of a modal or instrumental (rather than a temporal or strictly causal) adjunct to the principal verb, the most suitable method of rendering it is to employ the English present participle. A good example will be found in Thuc. I. 36 γνάτῳ . . . οὐ τὰ κράτιστα αὐταῖς (sc. Athens) προνοῶν ὅταν . . . ἐνδοιάζῃ χωρίον προσλαβεῖν ('in hesitating to welcome a state' . . .). Arist. eth. N. 6. 7. 1141<sup>b</sup> 6 'Αναξαγόραν καὶ Θαλῆν . . . σοφοὺς μὲν φρονίμους δ' οὐ φασιν εἶναι, ὅταν θέωσιν ἀγνοοῦντας τὰ συμφέροντ' ἔαντοις ('seeing how ignorant they are' . . ., Welldon). Isocr. 7. 54 τίς οὐκ ἀν ἐπὶ τοῖς γιγνομένοις τῶν εὐ φρονούντων ἀλγήσειν, ὅταν ἵδη κτέ. 9. 6 νῦν δὲ τίς οὐκ ἀν ἀθυμήσειν, ὅταν ὁρᾷ, . . . αὐτὸν δὲ προειδῇ κτέ. Lys. 19. 1 πολλὴν μοι ἀπορίαν παρέχει ὁ ἄγων οὐτοσὶ, ὅταν ἐνθυμηθῶ ὅτι κτέ. ('considering, as I do, that' . . .). The force of this statement would be very much impaired, if it could not be taken as a reflection by the speaker on his *present* perplexity. Xen. Hier. 6. 14 ἔχθροὶς δ' αὐτὸς ἀν φαίης μάλιστα τοῖς τυράννοις ἔχειναι χειρούσθαι, ὅταν εὐ εἰδῶσι ('knowing as they do' . . .) ὅτι ἔχθροι αὐτῶν εἰσι πάντες οἱ τυραννούμενοι; Now compare with these Soph. O. T. 658 εὐ νῦν ἐπίστω, ταῦθ' ὅταν ζητῆς, ἐμοὶ | ζητῶν δλεθρον ἡ φυγὴν ἐκ τῆσθε γῆς. Oedipus is answering a request of the chorus that he should not condemn Creon. The request has been made, and we should translate *ταῦθ' ὅταν ζητῆς* 'in seeking this': it is impossible to think of a reiteration of the demand.

This example from Sophocles may be put at the head of a list of similar cases, for which I know of no better description than Prof. Hale's (op. cit., p. 223), that they serve to *identify* two acts, through an identification of the times of action: 'when you say A (in the saying of A), you mean B'. Plat. Men. 74 E ὅταν οὔτω

λέγης, τότε οὐδὲν μᾶλλον φῆς τὸ στρογγύλον εἶναι στρογγύλον ἡ εὐθύνη; Theact. 146 Δ ὅταν λέγης σκυτικήν, μή τι ἄλλο φράζεις . . .; Dem. 18. 88 τὸ δ' ὑμεῖς ὅταν λέγω, τὴν πόλιν λέγω. 7. 7 ὅταν δὲ λέγη . . . ὡς ἐθέλει διαδικάσσασθαι, οὐδὲν ἀλλ' ἡ χλευάζει ύμᾶς. 20. 99 ὅταν ταῦτα λέγη δήπου, δρολογεῖ κτέ. 44. 49 ἀλλὰ μὴν γνησίων γ' ὅταν λέγη καὶ κυρίως κατὰ τὸν θεσμόν, παρακρούεται παρὰ τοὺς νόμους. ib. 64 ὅταν εἴπη νιδὸν γνήσιον ἐγκαταλείποντα ἐπανιέναι, δηλοὶ δήπου κτέ. 56. 23 τὸ ῥαγῆναι τὴν ναῦν ὅταν λέγη . . . ψεύδεται. ib. 25 τὴν μίσθωσιν τῶν πλοίων ὅταν λέγης, οὐ τοῦ ῥαγῆναι τὴν ναῦν τεκμήριον λέγεις. Lys. 30. 17 ὅταν ἐμὲ φάσκῃ ἀσεβεῖν . . . καὶ τῆς πόλεως κατηγορεῖ. Aeschin. 3. 237 ὅταν δὲ τῆς πρὸς Θηβαίους συμμαχίας τὰς αἰτίας ἀνατίθης Δημοσθένει, τοὺς μὲν ἀγνοοῦντας ἔχαπατάς κτέ. The cogency of these examples cannot be demonstrated in a short space, or without an examination of the whole of the context in every case; but, even as quoted above, they are manifestly similar to the following from Latin (cited with many others by Prof. Hale): Cic. Quinct. 81 *malo: si enim illud diceres, improbe mentiri viderere: quom hoc confiteris, id te admisisse concedis, quod ne mendacio quidem tegere possis.* Ter. Andr. prol. 18 *qui quom hunc accusant, Naevium, Plautum, Ennium | accusant, quos hic vostre auctores habet.* The inference is obvious that, as no one dreams of supposing that repeated action is expressed by the Latin idiom, it is unnecessary and unjustifiable to import any such idea into our interpretation of the Greek. A special case of this category arises, when *ὅταν λέγη* and the like are used to introduce a literary quotation. This is so common in later Greek as to need no illustration. It is the regular, if not the only formula in scholia, and in such writers as Athenaeus, Strabo, Hephaestion, Clement of Alexandria, and others who deal largely in quotation. We will content ourselves with two examples from Philodemus of Gadara, who belongs to an earlier age: *περὶ ποιημάτων* II 20 (ed. Haurath in Jahrb. Phil. Suppl. XVII 249) οἷον ὅταν ἐπὶ τοῦ πλευσιδιῶν Σοφοκλῆς εἴπη 'ναῦται δ' ἐμηρύσαντο νῆδος ἱσχάδα' (fr. 694). *περὶ εὐσεβείας* 9, 7, p. 75 G. Περσαῖος δὲ δῆλος ἐστιν . . . ἀφανίζων τὸ δαιμόνιον ἡ μηθὲν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ γινώσκων, ὅταν ἐν τῷ περὶ Θεῶν . . . λέγη κτέ. It is usual to brush aside the evidence of Hellenistic writers, as having little or no bearing upon the usage of the classical era. The proceeding is always of doubtful value, but for the present purpose we are not obliged to rely on inference alone, for there are extant instances which show that the same formula prevailed in the 4<sup>th</sup> century B. C. See Aeschin. 1. 128 *εὑρήσετε . . . τὸν Εὐριπίδην*

ἀποφαινόμενον τὴν θεὸν ταύτην οὐ μόνον τὸν ζῶντας ἐμφανίζειν δυναμένην, ὅποιοί τινες ἀν τυγχάνωσιν ὄντες, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς τετελευτηκότας, ὅταν λέγῃ, ‘φήμη τὸν ἐσθλὸν καν μυχῷ δείκνυσι γῆς’ (fr. 865). Plat. Ion 538 B τί δὲ δή, ὅταν ‘Ομηρος λέγῃ, ὡς τετρωμένῳ τῷ Μαχάονι Ἐκαμήδη ἡ Νέστορος παλλακῇ κυκεῶνα πίνειν δίδωσι; ib. C τί δὲ ὅταν λέγῃ ‘Ομηρος (quoting Ω 80 ff.), ταῦτα πότερον φῶμεν ἀλιευτικῆς εἶναι τέχνης κτέ.; Cf. Rep. 383 A πολλὰ ἄρα ‘Ομήρου ἐπαινοῦντες ἀλλα τοῦτο οὐκ ἐπαινεσόμεθα, τὴν τοῦ ἐνυπνίου πομπὴν ὑπὸ Διὸς τῷ Ἀγαμέμνονι · οὐδὲ Αἰσχύλου, ὅταν φῇ ἡ Θέτις τὸν Ἀπόλλω (fr. 350). In the last example it should be observed that the clause ὅταν φῇ κτέ. balances the accusative τοῦτο in the first member of the sentence, and is equivalent to ‘the speech of Thetis’.

So far I have endeavored to group together passages which are similar in structure or intention, and to show how the appearance of the conjunction in certain combinations tended to invest it with a meaning which did not originally belong to it. The examples now to be quoted are among those where the development is complete, and where no other relation than that of causality appears to exist between the subordinate and principal clauses. Isocr. 20. 3: the existence of a law in restraint of abusive language proves the serious nature of an actual assault. καίτοι πηλίκας τινὰς χρὴ ποιεῖσθαι τὰς τιμωρίας ὑπὲρ τῶν ἔργων παθόντων κακῶς, ὅταν ὑπὲρ τῶν λόγων μόνον ἀκηκοότων οὐτως ὀργιζόμενοι φαίνησθε; Isocr. 5. 79 ἵστως οὖν ὑπολαμβάνεις μικροψυχίαν εἶναι τὸ τῶν βλασφημούντων καὶ φλυαρούντων καὶ τῶν πειθομένων τούτοις φροντίζειν, ἀλλως θ' ὅταν (= *prae-  
sertim cum*) καὶ μηδὲν σαντῷ συνειδῆς ἔξαμαρτάνων. Cf. the corresponding use of ἀλλως τ' ἐπειδὴ in 2. 51, 4. 66. ib. 140: those who are capable both as politicians and as generals receive the highest praise. ὅταν οὖν ὁρᾶς (*cum igitur videas*) τὸν ἐν μῷ πόλει ταύτην ἔχοντας τὴν φύσιν εὐδοκιμοῦντας, ποίους τινὰς χρὴ προσδοκᾶν τοὺς ἐπαίνους ἔσεσθαι τοὺς περὶ σοῦ ῥηθησομένους; Lys. 8. 2 ἀνιαρὸν μὲν οὖν ἀναγκάζεσθαι λέγειν περὶ τούτων, ἀδύνατον δὲ μὴ λέγειν, ὅταν ἐναντίον τῆς ἐλπίδος κακῶς πάσχω καὶ τοὺς δοκοῦντας εἶναι φίλους ἀδικοῦντας εὐρίσκω (‘qui indignis modis acceptus sim’, Reiske). 28. 2 καίτοι πῶς αὐτοῖς χρὴ συγγνώμην ἔχειν, ὅταν ὄρατε τὰς μὲν ναῦς, δὲν ἥρχον οὐτοι, δι' ἀπορίαν χρημάτων καταλυομένας κτέ. Aeschin. 43. 45 ὅταν οὖν ἀποδείξῃ (sc. ὁ νομοθέτης) τοῖς μὲν ὑπὸ τῆς θουλῆς στεφανουμένοις εἰς τὸ θουλευτήριον ἀναρρηθῆναι . . . ‘Since there are definite legal enactments applying to other cases, the law in question must apply to ξενικοὶ στέφανοι’. Plat. Soph. 241 A is an admirable example. The Eleatic Stranger puts forward a definition of ψευδῆς λόγος as τὰ τε ὄντα λέγων μὴ εἶναι καὶ τὰ μὴ ὄντα

*είναι*, and then proceeds to point out that the Sophist will not accept it. *ἢ τίς μηχανὴ συγχωρεῖν τινα τὸν εὖ φρονούντων, ὅταν ἀφθεγκτα καὶ ἄρρητα καὶ ἀλογα καὶ ἀδιανόητα προδιωμολογημένα ἢ τὰ πρὸ τούτων ὀμολογηθέντα;* ‘and indeed how can any rational man assent to them, *seeing that* the very expressions which we have just used were before acknowledged by us to be unutterable’, etc. (Jowett). Dem. 27. 33 *καίτοι πόσον τινὰ χρὴ τὸν καταλειφθέντα (sc. ivory and iron—the stock-in-trade) νομίζειν είναι, ὅταν φαίνηται τηλικούτοις τε ἐργαστηρίοις ἔξαρκῶν κτέ.* ‘Since it is proved to have sufficed for factories of a certain size . . .’ 33. 31 *ὅταν δὴ διάντος ἡφαντικῶς φαίνηται τὰ γράμματα . . . πῶς ἀν . . . δικαίως ἐμὲ ἀπολέσαιτε;* ‘Since he is proved to have destroyed the documents . . .’ 34. 17 *τίνα οὖν ἄλλον χρὴ περιμένειν νῦν μάρτυρα, ὅταν τηλικαύτην μαρτυρίαν παρ’ αὐτῶν τούτων ἔχητε;* Dem. 45. 84: it is alleged against the speaker that Pasicles, his brother, takes the side of Phormio, his opponent. He replies by suggesting that Pasicles was really Phormio’s son. *ὅταν γὰρ τῷ δούλῳ συνδικῆ τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἀτιμῶν, καὶ παραπεπτωκὼς θαυμάζῃ τούτους ὑφ’ ὅν αὐτῷ θαυμάζεσθαι προσῆκε, τίν’ ἔχει δικαίων ταῦθ’ ὑποψίαν;* 15. 31: it is difficult for you to adopt the right policy owing to the opposition of traitors. *ὅταν οὖν μηδὲν ἢ διὰ τούτους ἀκοντεῖ τῶν δεόντων γενέσθαι, πολλῶν διαμαρτάνειν νῦν εἰκότως συμβαίνει.* [Dem.] *prooem.* 51: my opponents object to any further investigation of their conduct. *καίτοι ὅταν τοὺς ἔξελέγχειν βουλομένους δεινὰ ποιεῖν αἰτιᾶσθε, τί ἡμεῖς τοὺς ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς ἔξηπατηκότας τηνικαῦτα λέγωμεν;* ‘Since you say that a desire to investigate is monstrous, what are we to call the deceit that has been practised upon us?’ Ep. III 51 *ὅταν οὖν τοιαῦτα καὶ τηλικαῦτα πᾶσιν ἰδεῖν ἢ παραδείγματα (i. e. of the prosperity of traitors) . . . φοβοῦμαι μήποτ’ ἔρημοι τῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐρούντων γένησθε, ἄλλως τε καὶ ὅταν κτέ.* Lycurg. 116: if there had been only a single precedent, it might have been said that your ancestors acted in anger. *ὅταν δὲ παρὰ πάντων ὅμοίως εἰληφότες ὡσι τὴν αὐτὴν τιμωρίαν, πῶς οὐκ εῦδηλον ὅτι φύσει πᾶσι τοῖς τοιούτοις ἔργοις ἐπολέμουν;* Aeschin. 3. 16 *ὅταν . . . δὲ νομοθέτης ἀρχὰς ὀνομάζῃ, οὗτοι δὲ προσαγορεύωσι πραγματείας καὶ ἐπιμελείας, ὑμέτερον ἔργον ἐστὶν ἀπομνημονεύειν καὶ ἀντιτάπτειν τὸν νόμον πρὸς τὴν τούτων ἀναίδειαν.* Dinarch. 3. 9 is a remarkable instance. The reference is to the office of *στρατηγὸς εἰς τὴν Μουνιχίαν* (cf. Arist. resp. Ath. 61, 1), to which Philocles *had already been appointed*. *τί γὰρ τοῦτον οὐκ ἀν οἰεσθ’ ἀποδόσθαι τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει σπουδαιοτάτων, ὅταν ἡμεῖς ὡς πιστὸν αὐτὸν καὶ δίκαιον φύλακα καταστήσητε;* (‘quando constituitis’ is the old Latin version). Lys. 28. 15 is of interest, as an example of adversative rather than of strictly causal bearing.

The defendant Ergocles claims consideration as one of the democrats who returned from Phyle. Lysias argues that this makes his misdeeds in office all the worse, because he was appointed as a champion of freedom. *ὅταν γὰρ ἡγησάμεθα σωτηρίας ἀντειλῆφθαι, δεινότερα ὑπὸ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἀρχόντων πάσχομεν η ὑπὸ τῶν πολεμίων.* Reiske conjectured *ὅτε . . . ἡγησάμεθα*, which does not fit *πάσχομεν*, and Kayser accordingly introduced a further change to *ἐπάσχομεν*. But the text is much better as it stands. Translate, 'Now that we have come to believe that . . .'; or 'Despite our conviction that . . .'. Plat. rep. 339 Ε οἷον τοίνυν, ην δ' ἐγώ, καὶ τὸ ἀξύμφορα ποιεῖν τοῖς ἀρχοντὶς τε καὶ κρείττονι δίκαιον εἶναι ὡμολογῆσθαι σοι, ὅταν οἱ μὲν ἀρχοντες ἀκούτες κακὰ αὐτοῖς προστάττωσιν, τοῖς δὲ δίκαιον εἶναι φῆς ταῦτα ποιεῖν ἢ ἐκεῖνοι προσέταξαν. Adam's note labors under the bias of the assumption that *ὅταν* must always mean 'whenever'. He starts by saying 'these two clauses depend, not on *ώμολογῆσθαι*, but on *ποιεῖν*'; but his paraphrase shows that he really understands them as belonging to *δίκαιον εἶναι*. Afterwards candor forces him to admit that Plato has failed to express what he means. "Desire for brevity and balance leads Plato to put both clauses under the government of *ὅταν*, although 'since' rather than 'whenever' is the more appropriate conjunction for introducing the second: for Thrasymachus does not sometimes but always assert that it is just to obey the rulers." But, if we are prepared to allow that *ὅταν* means 'inasmuch as', there is no difficulty whatever in attaching the clauses to *ώμολογῆσθαι*, especially if we bear in mind that the *μέν*-clause is logically subordinate<sup>1</sup>, and that the real connection is *ώμολογῆσθαι* *ὅταν φῆς*. Thus we return to the category of identification. 'You have admitted that justice is not the interest of the stronger *in your assertion* that, even though they unwittingly prescribe their own injury, it is just to obey them.'

I will conclude by quoting a few examples—taken quite at random—from later Greek, for the purpose of showing that the same type of construction continued to prevail, although the conjunction was gradually losing its distinctive character, and was even combined with the indicative (e. g. Plut. comm. not. 30, p. 1074 D: see also Moulton, N. T. Gramm., § 168). Plut.

<sup>1</sup> The principle is familiar, but the preference given to grammatical antithesis often extends so far as to obscure the meaning: see e. g. Jebb on Soph. O T. 419.

Demosth. 11 μὴ θαυμάζετε τὰς γινομένας κλοπάς, ὅταν τοὺς μὲν κλέπτας χαλκοῦς, τοὺς δὲ τοίχους πηλίνους ἔχωμεν. Qu. conv. viii 6. 1, p. 726 Α θάττον γὰρ ἡ βάδην ἐπειγόμενον, ὅταν βραδύνη ('because he has loitered'), φαίνεσθαι—an explanation of τρεχόδειπνος. [Arist.] de mund. 4: lightning is seen before thunder is heard, ὅταν τὸ μὲν τάχιστον γῆ τῶν ὅντων, λέγω δὲ τὸ πυρῶδες. Epict. diss. IV 1. 51 ὅταν οὖν μήτε οἱ βασιλεῖς λεγόμενοι ζῶσιν ὡς θέλουσι . . . τίνες ἔτι εἰσὶν ἀλεύθεροι; Cebes Tab. 39 οὐδὲ συμφέρει ἄρα ἐνίοις πλουτεῖν, ὅταν μὴ ἐπίστωται τῷ πλούτῳ χρῆσθαι. Aristid. I 746 πῶς ὑμῖν γε θαρρεῖν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀλευθερίας ἔξεστιν, ὅταν μηδὲ δουλεύειν ἀλλήλοις ἔξῃ. Galen de Hipp. et Plat. plac. II 8, p. 246 M. ὅταν ταῦτα διογένης γράφῃ . . . οὐδὲν ἐν γε τῷ παρόντι φέσομεν ἀμφισβητεῖν.

I do not wish to lengthen this article by dealing with ἐπειδάν, which is properly regarded as the congener of ὅταν. A clear example of its causal application will be found in Xen. Hier. 8. 7.

A. C. PEARSON.

#### IV.—IMAGINATION AND WILL IN MH.

##### I.

The two functions of  $\mu\nu$  offer a constant challenge. What was the relation between them? There is no reason to suppose that  $\mu\nu$  had a double origin. To the Greek mind the word was one; all its uses must have seemed to them closely akin. From the point of view of Sanskrit, in which  $mā$  is limited to expressions of will, it certainly appears as if the original function of  $\mu\nu$  were to present the negation as willed. Yet it is hard to see how the other function, as the negation of a conception, in contrast with  $o\nu$  as the negation of fact, can have grown out of that. No one has made such a process appear plausible. One can only say, it must have been so, because willed negation was the earlier function, since that alone appears in Sanskrit and the other is purely Greek.

And then there is that curious extension of  $\mu\nu$  at the cost of  $o\nu$ , which was so marked in post-classical times. Long before Homer, but not until Greek had set up for itself as a distinct language, the speakers of Greek began to develop the latent possibilities of  $\mu\nu$  and extend its range. They had carried the process far by Homer's time, still farther in the Athens of Plato; Lucian and the rest, in taking  $\mu\nu$  beyond the range allowed by Plato, were but following an impulse that had been active much longer than a millennium. The interplay of  $\mu\nu$  and  $o\nu$  from Homer down offers a succession of challenges. My own interest in the negatives was greatly stimulated by the endeavor to follow Plato's delicate shadings of thought as he passes from one to the other. Of course in most cases there is no difficulty; the general differences are clear. And where the point is more subtle, since we have in English no ready means of marking it, we can often glide around it, with no sense of loss. But not always; the reader now and again finds himself puzzling over the question, Just what did he mean by choosing here this negative and not that?

The classic differences between  $\omega\nu$  and  $\mu\nu$ , said the editor of this Journal in the first number (p. 48) "are sufficiently well known, if not sufficiently well formulated, nor referred to sufficiently satisfactory causes. The view which considers  $\omega\nu$  as the negative of statement,  $\mu\nu$  as originally the negative of the will, I am content to accept. How the negative of the will comes to be used in all its varied relations, this is not the place to develop. Suffice it that we find these two negatives in the very beginning so clearly distinguished, so accurately used, that we can recognize in them a sharper modality than obtains even in the moods. . . . Still there is a certain borderland, which in the classic period was occasionally invaded by  $\mu\nu$ ; and it is just this borderland on which  $\mu\nu$  has squatted so resolutely in the post-classic times". The present paper is an attempt, by closer analysis of early usage, to connect more rationally the classical uses of  $\mu\nu$ , in the hope of throwing a little more light on that borderland where  $\mu\nu$  and  $\omega\nu$  are in the classic period both at home, each carrying with it, presumably, a shade or a tone which the other did not have. It is not claimed that the resulting illumination is all we could desire. We must operate with hypotheses rather than proof; from the nature of the problem we must be content if we can frame a hypothesis that seems to fit the facts, and in a sense explain them, better than other hypotheses. And readers of this Journal do not need to be told that the paper could never have been written without the frequent discussions by the editor in these pages, beginning with the above mentioned first number. It is the more proper to emphasize this relation, because at the outset I adopt a different view from that accepted in the paragraph quoted.

## II.

To assume that willed negation was the primary force of  $\mu\nu$  is to assume a long and hitherto unexplained leap at some time from this to the other function. Such a difficulty is commonly taken as a good indication of something dubious in a hypothesis. And then, must we at all hazards take Sanskrit usage as the starting-point? Sanskrit is not, after all, the parent tongue of Greek, but an older and rather distant cousin. If we could trace each of them back to the unknown date before their lines began to diverge, we should pass, along each line, through many stages, deserving each to be distinguished by a distinct name. It is our

complete ignorance of those intermediate stages that permits us to imagine anything resembling a descent of Greek linguistic phenomena from Sanskrit phenomena that distantly, or even closely, correspond. We must beware of allowing ourselves to be thus unconsciously misled. No doubt *mā* and *μή* are related, and retain points of resemblance from their remote common ancestor. But great differences have come in. These are no more to be ignored than is the partial resemblance. They point to different lines of development. There is no positive ground for assuming that *mā* has retained all of the original force while *μή* has in Homer taken on additions. As Greek has retained an earlier fulness of vowel scheme, *a*, *ε*, *ο*, which Sanskrit has reduced to *a* alone, why may not *μή* have retained a fuller semantic content while *mā* has lost something—has shrunk or been crowded back? I am not trying to prove that *mā* has lost something or been crowded back; I only protest against the assumption, as if it needed no evidence, that the narrow use of *mā* is and must be the whole primitive word, out of which *μή* has been developed. We know nothing about that. A corresponding belief once prevailed about Sanskrit *a* and Greek *a*, *ε*, *ο*; but we have learned better. What the Hellenist as such desires to know is the Greek atmosphere of *μή*. No Greek of Homer's day was conscious of the remote origin either of his words or of their semantic atmosphere. Homeric Greek is the earliest that later Greeks knew—to them the beginning of development. We must find their primitive thought of *μή* in Homer, and must beware of trying to cross waters where there is neither bridge nor ferry.

If now we leave *mā* out of the question and start from early Greek usage, some things wear a different look. First, as a negative of will we note that *μή* occupies a far wider field than *mā*. Even on that side the two have long parted company. But the other function is no less firmly established in Homer, and has there just as primitive a look. Was that the real starting-point? G. Hermann thought it was: "quum particula *μή* negationi exprimendae inserviat, quam philosophi subjectivam vocant; usurpatur de ea re, quae tota in cogitatione versatur".<sup>1</sup> Matthiae took the same view,<sup>2</sup> regarding the negative of will as a form of the negative of conception. Similarly Aken, who says:<sup>3</sup> "Sonach bezeichnet *μή* eine Negirung für das Reich des Ab-

<sup>1</sup> Opusc. I, p. 229 f.

<sup>2</sup> Gr. Gram. § 608 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Temp. u. Mod. § 315.

stracten oder Ideellen, *ov* für das des Realen d. h. das diesem als irgendwie angehörig behauptete. Von jenem ist das prohibitive *μή* nur eine Anwendung". But obviously these views have not prevailed. Can they be restated in more convincing form? The attempt is perhaps worth while, and I shall venture to set forth the line of thought by which, while unfortunately ignorant of the views of more distinguished predecessors, I arrived at similar conclusions.

Few have that gift of divination which enables one to discern confidently and describe with precision several distinct stages of pre-Homeric growth. But putting aside all claim to have discovered the precise order of historical development in the period before we know the language, we may, by approaching the matter from this side, discover at least logical relations that make historical development of the prohibitive function from the other seem not only possible but probable. We meet no such difficulty in conceiving the unity of the two functions as we do in starting from the prohibitive. The categories, if the term steps of development must be excluded, may be distinguished and their relations indicated as follows.

1. The imperative is a verb-form expressing will on the part of the speaker, primarily will that something be or be done. That is, an action or state is imagined—a conception, not yet a reality—realizable in the future, if at all; and the speaker expresses his will that it be realized. If now that imagined state or act is negated, the negative should naturally be, not the one which denies a fact, but that which negatives a conception, if the language habitually makes that distinction. In the combined expression each part performs its proper office; the whole becomes a willed negative conception. But in the primitive *μή* *μ' ἐρέθισε* we are not to see in the *μή* any trace of will. That is fully contained in the verb-form, without *μή* as distinctly as with it; *μή* is fully accounted for on the other basis. So if *μή* is connected with an independent optative, like elements of thought are conveyed, with variations in detail as command shades into wish, advice, prayer, curse. The verb-form expresses wish; *μή* simply negatives a conception.

2. With an independent subjunctive, however, *μή* begins to exhibit a semantic change. The verb by its mode indicates a conception (perhaps originally a willed conception?) which may hereafter become a fact. With *ov*, the negative of the concrete,

the expression becomes in Homer a negative statement in reference to the future, a denial that the conception will be realized—οὐδὲ οὐδεις *and I shall not see*. With μή on the other hand the conception expressed in the verb is negated without emerging from the realm of imagination. In μή σε κιχείω, by the choice of μή, the speaker refuses to contemplate as a future fact the thought of his again meeting Chryses there; he proposes that the conception shall not so emerge into reality. The whole can therefore be nothing else than an expression of will; verb and negative cooperate, more subtly, but in essentially the same way, as do μή and an imperative or μή and an optative. Only, with an imperative οὐ could not be used, if οὐ denies a fact and μή is the conceptual negative, while with the subjunctive either οὐ or μή could stand, with a sharp difference in total meaning. In the far less frequent case of an optative without ἀντί or κανείν but with οὐ a like difference was felt. It was the choice between μή and οὐ that made the difference. The prohibitive force inevitably appeared, in such cases, to reside in the μή.

3. When now many expressions of this type were associated with numerous imperatives and optatives negated by μή, the whole in each case expressing will, it was inevitable that μή itself should acquire a prohibitive, rejecting, deprecatory tone. Thus it became ready for extension, in that sense, to the indicative.

4. Hence for example Hera's passionate protestation,

μή δέ έμην ιόντη Ποσειδάων ἐνοσίχθων  
πημαίνει Τρόάς τε καὶ Ἐκτόρα. O 41 f.

The note of Ameis-Hentze on this passage covers the ground and cites the parallels; so do Liddell and Scott under μή, and Monro's Homeric Grammar § 358. In each case the appeal of the oath precedes; then in a grammatically independent clause follows the protestation, μή with an indicative, here present, in K 330 future, in T 261 aorist.<sup>1</sup> Aristophanes could still use future and aorist so. Closely akin is the deprecatory question,

ἢ μή τις σεν μῆλα βροτῶν ἀέκοντος ἐλαίνει; Ι 405.

These various uses of μή with finite verb lead easily to its use as a subordinating conjunction.

5. With the infinitive meantime μή was apparently undergoing a like treatment. A *for* dative, syntactically the original status (at least the prevailing status) of the infinitive, implies an aim, is

<sup>1</sup> True, the indicative is an emendation, but a practically certain one.

an expression of a goal toward which some one is urging, or at least a goal toward which something is tending. There is no reason to doubt that the Homeric infinitive is primarily an expression of purpose or of "quasi-purpose",<sup>1</sup> whether without a negative or with it. Here too therefore we need not look to the negative to find the expression of will. But an infinitive is first of all a *nomen actionis*, an abstract noun, freed, in primitive usage, from specific circumstances of person and number and time. It has no future; *aktionsart* is implied in the stem, but no *zeitstufe*, until later. As an abstract noun, therefore, without reference to the will suggested by the case, it should take *μή* as its negative. It is true that Greek infinitives of this earlier type are not found with a negative in Homer. Such infinitives are there regularly positive—*ξυνέκε μάχεσθαι*, *λείπε φορῆναι*, *ἀργαλίος ἀντιφέρεσθαι*, and the like. But the infinitive in the so-called "imperative sense" was common enough with *μή*, without subject or with a nominative—*μή τι διατρίβειν* Δ 42, *μή μοι πρὸν λέναι*, *Πατρόκλεις* Π 839, *μή τι σύ γ' ἀθανάτουσι θεοῖς ἀντικρὺ μάχεσθαι* Ε 130. If one maintains that such infinitives with *μή* were not used until *μή* had already taken on its prohibitive tone, we cannot confute him historically. But we still have to account for the fact that *μή* soon became, if it was not already, the regular conceptual negative with infinitives, where no trace of will remains. Absence from the conventional style of Homer does not quite prove absence from speech. The hypothesis here offered accords with analogies and contradicts none. To me it seems more probable than the leap required by the other starting-point. And such a course of development would be another influence tending to impart to *μή* itself that tone of will which it had fully acquired before Homer.

All I can claim to have shown so far is that the acquisition of this meaning, if we conceive the process in the way indicated, is not only natural, but inevitable. So conceived the functions which we naturally think of as two are seen to be at bottom one. So clear and so clarifying did this appear to me that I ventured in 1902 to say in an elementary grammar, "Both meanings are in so far one that both represent a negative as conceived rather than as fact." And of course this is but restating what Hermann, Matthiae, and Aken had stated before.

<sup>1</sup> Gildersleeve, A. J. P. XXXI, p. 78.

## III.

Meantime the unquestionable *μή* of imagination is also in Homer. It is not very abundant; the range is narrow as compared with that in Plato; the Homeric man had little leaning toward abstraction. He readily conceived the imaginary as real, the abstract or general as concrete or individual, and was far more inclined to do so than the subtle Athenian. Homer and Plato are at the opposite ends of the scale in that regard. But there are enough typical cases in Homer where there is no shade of will.

We will not dwell on *εἰ* clauses with optative and *μή*, because one may insist on wish as the foundation of such conditions. Nor on *εἰ* clauses with subjunctives and *μή*, although they seem to me good cases. But how shall we regard *εἰ μή* with the indicative? In *εἰ μή τις θεός ἔστι κοτεσσάμενος Τρώεσσιν ΕΙ77*, if it stood alone, one might indeed take *μή* as deprecatory; Aineias clearly hopes the warrior is not an angered god. But that will not fit *εἰ μή τις γρηγός ἔστι παλαιή, κεδνὰ ίδνια τ 346*. Odysseus knows there is one; his plan is to get speech with her; nothing suggests that he is going so far as to adopt a deprecatory tone; he merely puts the possibility in the simplest logical form. In *εἰ μὲν δὴ μή τις σε βιάζεται τ 410 μή* does indeed emphasize the jest, but not in violation of idiom. Again, in *εἰ μή νῦν ἐλθούσα διακρινέται μένος ἀνδρῶν Β 387* one might fancy a deprecatory tone. But not in *εἰ μή τις Δαναῶν νῦν Ἐκτόρος ἀντίος εἰσιν Η 98*, nor in *εἰ μή σύ γε δύσεαι ἀλκήν Ι 231*. As to the latter, Odysseus desires above all that Achilles shall put on might. Similarly in *εἰ δὴ μή παιδῶν τε καστιγνήτων τε φονῆς τισόμεθ' ο 434 f.* All together these clauses can be taken only as the ordinary conditional forms that became later so abundant, negative suppositions in which *μή* exhibits no trace of will, but negatives a conception, precisely as we have suggested was the case originally with imperative, optative, subjunctive, and infinitive.

Still more clearly in unreal conditions. Ebeling's lexicon cites from the Iliad thirtyfive unreal conditions of the form *εἰ μή* with the aorist, and eleven from the Odyssey. Two of these (Γ 374, Ε 312) are *εἰ μή ἄρ' ὁξὲν νόησε Διός θυγάτηρ Ἀφροδίτη*, and four more begin the same, varying the subject only. Call these one, and we shall have thirty and eleven. In none of the fortyone is there any trace of a wishing origin. The type *δείδω μὴ δὴ πάντα θεὰ νημερτέα εἰπεν ε 300* would compel us to assume as an earlier stage,

And one<sup>2</sup> clear case of the generalizing relative clause in the indicative occurs:

ἐστὲ δὲ πάντες | μάρτυροι, οὓς μὴ κῆρες ἔβαν θανάτου φέρουσαι Β 302

No will is conceivable here, no passionate protest, nothing to differentiate this from the Attic idiom. *oī* might just as easily have been used, even to the meter, only with different tone, lacking the generalization.

We find then that in our earliest Greek the conceptual  $\mu\eta$  is quite at home, as primitive-looking as the  $\mu\eta$  of will, whose development from conceptual  $\mu\eta$  is easily traceable. The  $\mu\eta$  of will has in Homer come nearer to its later Attic range. But the other is there; it has ample root and stock for the later growth to meet the need of less objective, more reflective poets, and of thinkers, Ionic and Athenian.

One plausible objection to the foregoing account should be faced. One may say that primitive man does not feel the need of a negative for the abstract, while full expression of will is an early desire. That kind of argument once had a large place in linguistic discussion, and the fallacy of it has been detected. It is one form of the assumption that races who are different from

<sup>1</sup> Hom. Gram.<sup>2</sup>, §§ 316, 359.

<sup>2</sup> And only one (Monro, l. c., § 359 b). B. L. G.

ourselves are therefore inferior, in an earlier stage of advancement in every particular—an assumption that we consider comic when made by another folk about us. Where are the "primitive" races who already possess a highly developed language and a literature? Whenever we catch a race it is old, its language the product of uncounted generations of change, and full of fragments that seem anomalous because they are remnants from an earlier stage. We need to remind ourselves that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are the culmination of a long period of literature, as well as the beginning of a new one. As for subtlety, the "man in the street" of Shakspere's London seems to have distinguished shall and will instinctively—a distinction that we are losing, and that Scotchmen are said to be incapable of learning—which so delicate a stylist as R. L. Stevenson never could master. Early Greek minds felt constantly the need of durative and aorist stems, a distinction which we feel no need for outside of the indicative, and can express but imperfectly. The question is always one of fact. Were  $\mu\eta$  and  $\omega\bar{n}$  in fact so distinguished, and did  $\mu\eta$  conceptual dominate the sphere of  $\mu\eta$ ? If so, it was because the pre-Homeric mind felt the utility of such forms of expression, though we do not. So far as our needs and those of our English-speaking predecessors are concerned, a negative of will is as subtle and foreign as a negative of conception.

## IV.

We will not here attempt to follow the steps by which the infinitive came to accept  $\omega\bar{n}$ , and  $\mu\eta$  spread to its Platonic limits. Nor is it necessary to repeat the description of those limits. Perhaps the only positive gain for interpretation to be gathered from this view of  $\mu\eta$  is a little greater readiness to see conceptual  $\mu\eta$  instead of searching for an elusive will.

The feeling seems never to have been wholly lost that  $\mu\eta$  was rather more at home with the infinitive than  $\omega\bar{n}$ , and a slight excuse might revive it in place of  $\omega\bar{n}$ .  $\delta\mu\nu\nu\mu$  always called for  $\mu\eta$ , which Homer and Aristophanes put even with the indicative, in passionate protestations after an oath.  $\mu\alpha\tau\nu\rho\hat{\omega}$ ,  $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\nu\omega$ ,  $\pi\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$  usually follow the same principle.  $\epsilon\xi\pi\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\mu\alpha\iota$  the same in Soph. El. 907 f.; occasionally  $\sigma\iota\mu\alpha\iota$ ,  $\nu\mu\iota\zeta\omega$ , even  $\phi\eta\mu\iota$  and  $\lambda\acute{e}\gamma\omega$ . In most of these cases, and others like them, no doubt the sense of will is the determining thing. So too in oracular responses. Perhaps  $\delta\mu\alpha\log\hat{\omega}$  and  $\sigma\gamma\chi\omega\rho\hat{\omega}$  belong with these. Yet with these

last, as with *φημι*, *λέγω*, *νομίζω*, it is noteworthy that a large proportion of the dependent infinitives with *μή* contain a general principle rather than a specific fact. So ἀρτὶ ἔλεγον μηδένα ἔθελεν ἐκόντα ἀρχειν Plat. Rep. 346 e. The direct form was ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἔθελες ἀρχειν ἐκάνει 345 e. Does not the generalization offer a better ground for *μή* conceptual than any hint of will does for the other *μή*. So φῆσομεν, ὡς ἔγα διάλογοι, μηδέποτε μηδὲν ἀν μεῖζον μηδὲ ἔλαττον γενέσθαι μήτε δύκινο μήτε ἀριθμός, ἔως ἵστον εἴη αὐτὸς ἔαντος Theaet. 155 a. Here is emphatic assertion certainly, but philosophic coolness rather than emotion. Is will a determining influence on the statement of a general philosophical principle? In τὶ γάρ καὶ φῆσομεν οἴ γε καὶ αὐτὸς δύμολογοῦμεν περὶ αὐτῶν μηδὲν εἰδέναι Euthyph. 6 b is not the thought "we admit complete ignorance on the subject"? As in many such cases our free use of abstract nouns offers a ready equivalent of *μή*. In Phaedo 94 c ὁμολογήσαμεν, in 93 d προωμολόγηται is followed by a negative philosophical generalization about the soul. It is hard to see any influence of will in these. Beside them we may put τὸ μὲν γάρ ἐπιστήμης μηδὲν εἶναι κρείττον δύμολογοῦσιν, τὸ δὲ μηδένα πράττειν παρὰ τὸ δόξαν βελτιον οὐχ δύμολογοῦσιν Arist. N. E. 1145 b 32 f. Here the infinitive clauses are unmistakably generalized by the article; but is the tone essentially different? Beside these may be placed ὁμολόγει γάρ οὐκ εἰδέναι Arist. Soph. El. 183 b 8, *he used to admit that he didn't know*—specific over against the general. In the following, ἀλλ' ὅρα δὴ εἰ οὐτως ὅριζε, μή μόνον τὸ ἐναντίον τὸ ἐναντίον μή δέχεσθαι ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκεῖνο . . . . μηδέποτε δέξασθαι Phaed. 105 a, one may feel that οὐτως helps out a bit, making the infinitive stand in a sort of apposition, but if οὐτως were not there, the negative would be the same. So in λέγω γάρ αὐτὸς τῇδε, μηδένα δοξάζειν ὡς τὸ αἰσχρὸν καλὸν ή ἀλλο τι τῶν τοιούτων Theaet. 190 cd, it is hardly τῇδε that determines the negative, and reminiscence of will is surely more remote than the obvious generalization, which of itself is so constantly associated with *μή*.

Leaving infinitives, a few other passages will illustrate the principle. First the well known lines Soph. Ant. 685 f.

ἔγω δ' ὅπως σὺ μή λέγεις ὅρθως τάδε  
οὐτ' ἀν δυναίμην μήτ' ἐπισταίμην λέγειν.

In simple and unemotional prose this might be ὡς οὐκ ὅρθως ταῦτα λέγεις οὐκ ἀν δυναίμην λέγειν. But this contains, though so put only to repudiate it, the statement οὐκ ὅρθως λέγεις. By substituting οὐτως μή λέγεις Haimon delicately puts the matter as a pure con-

ception, with no suggestion of fact. *ὅπως* perhaps contributes to the softening of tone, but conceptual *μῆ* is the central thing.

Two other disputed and puzzling cases appear to receive some light from such considerations. The first is Thuk. I 90, 1, *ἥδιον ἀν δρῶντες μήτ' ἐκείνους μήτ' ἄλλον μηδένα τεῖχος ἔχοντα*. Here one may say truly that *μῆ* is virtually conditional. This is equivalent to saying that it is *μῆ* conceptual. The Spartans would have preferred to see a non-existent state of affairs, entire absence of fortifications around Greek cities. *μῆ* with a predicate participle, in the right context, is sufficiently compact of imagination to carry a suggestion of non-existence as well as any other form of supposition. The other is really a group of passages, beginning with Phaedo 106 d *σχολῇ γὰρ ἀν τι ἄλλο φθορὰν μὴ δέχοιτο, εἰ τό γε ἀθάνατον ἀίδιον δν φθορὰν δέξεται*. Archer-Hind comments: "It is easier to feel the correctness of *μῆ* than to explain it grammatically. The meaning is, 'hardly could there be anything else incapable of admitting destruction, if the immortal, being eternal, will admit it'. *μὴ δέχοιτο φθοράν* is in fact equivalent to *εἴη τὸ μὴ δεχόμενον φθοράν*. Wohlrab compares Crat. 429 d *πῶς γὰρ ἀν . . . . λέγουν γέ τις τοῦτο, δέ λέγει, μὴ τὸ δν λέγοι; Add Gorg. 510 d τίνα ἀν τρόπον ἔγω μέγα δυναίμην καὶ μηδείς με ἀδικοί; Also Thuc. VI 18 ὅστε τί ἀν λέγοντες εἰκόσῃ αὐτοὶ ἀποκρούμενη πρὸς τοὺς ἐκεῖ ἔνυμάχους σκητόμενοι μὴ βοηθοῦμεν*". This is clearly right. In these four passages<sup>1</sup> *μῆ* with a hypothetical optative (potential if one prefers), an independent clause, adds that tone of generalization or characterization with which we are so familiar in relative clauses and with participles. It is plain conceptual *μῆ* in a less usual setting. To say that *σχολῇ* is virtually equivalent to *οὐ* is perhaps an approximation to the same statement; but it is less accurate, and rather avoids the real point than states it, and cannot be applied to the Gorgias passage.<sup>2</sup>

This is enough to indicate the direction in which, as I think, one may look to find a little practical gain from this view of *μῆ*. The two phases of the word being really one, naturally they cannot always be disentangled. But the conceptual tone was ever ready to come to the front, and was more often brought into play than is commonly supposed.

THOMAS D. GOODELL.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

<sup>1</sup> Rather in three; the Gorgias passage by itself strongly suggests wish.

<sup>2</sup> Which supports the preceding note. < Cf. A. J. P. XIX 233. B. L. G. >

## V.—USQUE RECURRET MH.

In one of Wilkie Collins' novels, immensely popular in its day—*The Moonstone*—the old house-steward who tells the story, a *homo unius libri*, finds everything in Robinson Crusoe; and I have doubtless been accused of finding everything in Pindar, like the fantastic scholar cited in a previous number of the Journal (XXXII 480). So the readers of *Brief Mention*<sup>1</sup> will not be surprised when they are told that Professor Goodell's article on  $\mu\acute{\eta}$  reminds me of the Fourth Pythian. The Fourth Pythian is a Story of Returns. Everything in that poem comes back, everybody comes back. If Absyrtus had been mentioned, Absyrtus too would have come back. So much in my long life has come back that I am never surprised to see a return to Hermann, such as my youth witnessed in the return to Kant. Hermann's theory of  $\bar{\alpha}$  is a workable hypothesis, if he had only known how to apply it (A. J. P. III 447), and Professor Goodell, whose opinions are always entitled to respectful consideration, finds himself more nearly in accord with Hermann's view of  $\mu\acute{\eta}$  than with the dominant view that  $\mu\acute{\eta}$  is a negative of the will. That is my view (A. J. P. I 48), but in my case the view is not based on Sanskrit. As a pupil of Ritschl I followed to my cost the commandment 'Du sollst nicht Sanskritwurzeln klauben', and I am obliged to take on faith the teachings of Sanskrit scholars; so that my consolation must be the question, How many Greek scholars who know Sanskrit can control it? (A. J. P. XXXIII 109). I am an ethnical grammarian, and have in consequence been relegated to the court of the Gentiles by those who maintain that my kind of syntax belongs to the dark ages of Greek grammar.

Let us ask, then, what  $\mu\acute{\eta}$  means without Sanskrit, and not only without Sanskrit but without a context, without an ellipsis; for though the days of Lambertus Bos and his ellipses are long

<sup>1</sup>This note was intended for *Brief Mention*, and both by form and content belongs to that *Curta Supellex* of the Journal, but it seemed a pity to divorce it from the article to which it refers, and Professor Goodell has kindly consented to let it follow immediately upon his serious discussion of a subject which seems to be of perennial interest.

past, their ghosts haunt us still, and the value of isolation is not always appreciated. So, unless I am mistaken, the cases are best understood when they stand alone without the disturbing environment of the sentence. The nominative becomes the case of manifestation, the accusative reveals itself as the object conjured up or conjured down, the dative shews its appropriative force, and the loneliness of the genitive is its best definition. It is the case of the lacking half. *ἐκαστος ἡμῶν ἐστιν ἀνθρώπου ξύμβολον.* In like manner it seems to me that the independent use of the negative is instructive. So the negative of denial flung free,<sup>1</sup> as in the much vexed *οὐ μή*,<sup>2</sup> is a negative *in vacuo*.

What, then, does *μή* mean *in vacuo*? When I read *μή, μή, μή μ' ἀνέρη τις εἰμι*, I ask myself what *μή* means before one comes to *ἀνέρη*, and I need no ellipsis to *μή τριβὰς ἔτι. μή* is the negative of the will and this conception of *μή* harmonizes with the primacy of the will in the study of the acc., with the doctrine that makes the object effected the basic meaning of the accusative under which all others are subsumed (A. J. P. II 89, XXXI 77). 'Will' has not always the same creative strength. There is 'volonté', there is 'velléité'—a word we sadly lack in English. There is the clenched fist, there is the itching palm. 'Will', 'desire', 'fear', 'apprehension', 'question', are all phases indicated by *μή*, all recognizable in our earliest monuments. *μή* with the imperative, *μή* with the subjunctive, *μή* with the optative, *μή* with the infinitive. Surely nothing could be more volitive than they. As for *μή* with the indicative van Ginneken, *Principes de linguistique psychologique*, p. 199 tells us that in natural language the negative is not the logical negation, but the expression of the feeling of resistance. This makes *μή* the dominant negative, this makes it the great goddess Ma of the negative world, and reduces *οὐ* to the level of 'haud' (A. J. P. XVIII 69, foll. 123). *μή* with the indicative is a rebellion against a statement of fact, chiefly against the *fait accompli*, chiefly with what we call the unreal condition. With the present it may be resolved into a question, a question that springs from excitement, from a desire to ascertain. This is the source of the logical condition, as the imperative subjunctive is the source of

<sup>1</sup> See Classen on Thuc. 3, 66, 4; 5, 101.

<sup>2</sup> See Rehdantz<sup>4</sup>, Indices, s. v. *οὐ μή* from which it appears that as far back as 1867 Wentzel had hit upon the same explanation that I gave A. J. P. III 202; X 124; XIV 260; XVII 516; XVIII 460.

the anticipatory or legal condition, as the wish for or against is the source of the ideal and unreal conditions. In the Homeric indicative conditional sentence we have *εἰ οὐ* in prior clauses, *εἰ μή* in posterior clauses (Monro, H. G. § 359), a difference which reposes on the difference between a *res iudicata* and a matter still mooted. 'To understand *οὐ* and *μή* a certain mobility is necessary' (A. J. P. XIII 259). A dramatic shifting of the point of view is always possible.

In the history of the negatives there are two deep lines. One is the use of *μή* with the participle (A. J. P. XXIII 135), the other the triumphant encroachment of *μή* upon the domain of *οὐ* (A. J. P. I 45 foll.). *μή* with the participle was not possible until the participle began to avail itself of its rights as a predicate, and so began to represent all the forms of the conditional proposition. This was done in conscious opposition to *οὐ*. All this generic business of *μή* comes from that. So it will be seen that I have not repented of my paper on the encroachments of *μή* upon *οὐ* in the very first number of the Journal, the beginning of my various published notes on the negative.

I am too old to change. 'At fourscore it is too late a week'. Indeed, for me the Carlsbad process which coats the rose of language with the salts of grammar was completed long ago, when I wrote the articles on *οὐ* and *μή* for Liddell and Scott—articles sadly marred in the editing (A. J. P. XIX 233).

According to Professor Goodell, the conceptual has come to its own. According to my view there is only an extension based on the primal volitive. Well, grammatical theories are often made to work either way, and I have often compared them in my mind to a certain fresh-water polyp which was once alleged to digest equally well when turned inside out. Unfortunately for my comparison, I have been informed by competent authority that the hydra does not really behave in this Theramenes fashion, but I am not going to give up my comparison on that account. Why, Sir Thomas Browne proved in his *Pseudodoxia Epidemica* (published in 1646) that the elephant has joints in his legs, and yet Disraeli in one of his novels, written nearly two hundred years afterwards, tells us of politicians who used the jointless elephant as a type of the unbending statesman. And so my comparison, like the jointless elephant, must stand.

BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE

## VI.—ALBIUS AND TIBULLUS.

The fittest acknowledgment that I can make for the complimentary epithets 'very clever' and 'very plausible' bestowed by Mr. B. L. Ullman (A. J. P. XXXIII 149 sq.) on the discussion in my Selections from Tibullus, Appendix A, of the question, 'Was Tibullus the *Albius* of Horace?' will be to show that they may have more justification in its substance than readers of Mr. Ullman's paper would be apt to infer. I will not attempt to traverse the whole ground again. I will confine myself to considering certain points which are vital ones to his own solution of the problem.

If our investigation is to escape the 'flaws' so prevalent 'in classical research' at the present day, especially where a matter of literary criticism or history is in dispute, it is necessary that every portion of the evidence should be examined by itself, without prepossession and without reference to any deductions, that may be made from any other piece of evidence not at the moment before us. If this is done, and only if it be done, can we have any security that our final combination is the real resultant of its components. Does Mr. Ullman's treatment of the crucial passage Hor. Carm. I. 33. 1-4 conform to this condition? Let us see.

I quote the whole of the ode for a reason that will presently appear:

Albi, ne doleas plus nimio memor  
immitis *Glycerae*, neu miserabilis  
decantes elegos cur tibi iunior  
laesa praeitate fide.  
insignem tenui fronte *Lycorida*  
Cyri torret amor, Cyrus in asperam  
declinat *Pholoen*: sed prius Apulis  
iungentur capreae lupis  
quam turpi Pholoe peccet adultero.  
sic uisum Veneri cui placet imparis  
formas atque animos sub iuga aenea  
saeuo mittere cum ioco.  
ipsum me melior cum peteret Venus,  
grata detinuit compede *Myrtale*  
libertina, fretis acrior *Hadriae*  
curuantis Calabros sinus.

The interpretation of the words must engage us first; and here Mr. Ullman has a novelty. Believing that by the *Glycera* of Albius is meant the *Nemesis* of Tibullus, he would smooth the way to the identification by treating the proper name as a common one. He says:

It was one of the most common names of *hetaerae*, and Horace might just as well have used the common noun *meretrix*, except that it would be less refined and romantic. Horace himself uses the name a number of times for no particular individual but for the class. *Glycera* is, therefore, hardly a proper noun at all. Its use corresponds to that of *Gaia*, commonly used as a synonym for *mulier*.<sup>1</sup> Similar instances are common in all languages; cf. *Jezebel* (in. French *Mégère*), *Jehu*, etc.

It is here said that Horace uses the name 'a number of times for no particular individual, but for the class'. This is throwing dust in the eyes of the reader who has no *index nominum* to his Horace. Apart from the present passage the word occurs thrice in the poems. C. I. 19. 5 'urit me *Glycerae* nitor | splendentis Pario marmore purius' and III 19. 28 'me lensus *Glycerae* torret amor *meae*' may be taken together. Does Mr. Ullman really hope to convince anyone that *Glycera* is a mere substitute for *meretrix* here, or in I. 30. 3 'O Venus, regina Cnidi Paphique, | sperne dilectam Cypron et uocantis | ture te multo *Glycerae* decoram | transfer in aedem?' If a real person is here referred to, why should *Glycera* not have been her real name? and if but a figure of shadow, why should not the phantom have received a proper name from its maker? If some one says, 'Oh, then, the *Glycera* of these passages is different from the *Glycera* of Albius', what objection can Mr. Ullman raise? Has he not already said 'it was one of the most common names of *hetaerae*'? But even if Mr. Ullman had shown that *Glycera* was a synonym for *meretrix*, this would be of no use to him here. The topic of

<sup>1</sup> What are we to make of this? Has Mr. Ullman forgotten the ridicule which the unfortunate *iuris periti* incurred from Cicero for a far less sweeping assertion? 'in omni denique iure ciuili aequitatem reliquerunt, uerba ipsa tenerunt ut, quia in alicuius libris exempli causa id nomen inuenierant, putarent omnes mulieres, quae coemptionem facerent, Gaias uocari' *Murenæ* § 27. To take a familiar example, would he contend that because John Doe and Richard Roe are frequently put for names of persons in legal language an English writer would refer to the lamentations of the *immritis Shylock* as the lamentations of the 'ruthless Roe' and expect to be understood? His modern parallels do not help him, as he has left out of sight the obvious consideration that Latin has no means of distinguishing between 'Jehu' and 'a jehu' or 'the jehu'.

consolation addressed to the subject of this ode is that the course of love is never smooth. And for this purpose *particular* instances are cited, and cited by name. As Lycoris finds Cyrus, as Cyrus finds Pholoe, as Horace finds Myrtale, so does Albius find Glycera. If Cyrus, Pholoe and Myrtale are names of persons then Glycera also should be the name of a person. If Glycera is a synonym of *meretrix*, then Pholoe and Myrtale should be synonyms of *meretrix* too.

The ground thus cleared of Mr. Ullman's unauthorized intruder, the common name "Glycera", we can ask what Horace intends us to understand by what he says in this ode. His words are plain; and when set out yield the following results: A certain friend of his (1) Albius by name, has been (2) writing piteous elegies because (3) his mistress 'Glycera' has (4) cast him off for a younger rival. Now apart from (1) the matter at issue, there are three statements here and Mr. Ullman rejects two of them. He says, contradicting Horace, that the mistress of Horace's Albius was not Glycera, and he says, again contradicting Horace, that his rival was a richer (not a younger) man. But he fails to see where this method should carry him. If we disbelieve that this elegiac writer's mistress was Glycera, why should we believe that his own name was Albius? And why should Horace not have been as 'inexact' in reporting his metre as he has been in describing his rival? In our haste to show that Tibullus was the Albius of Horace, we have destroyed the credit of the witness on whose testimony we wish to rely. And after all, what is gained by the proceeding? Suppose for the moment that Tibullus *was* called Albius. There is only one way of proving that he is referred to in the ode. And that is for some person with the proper credentials to come forward and say 'I have acquainted myself with the whole of the facts as they were known to the poet's contemporaries, and I can aver with certainty that the *only* 'Albius' who wrote 'elegies' at that time was 'Albius Tibullus', and consequently that his friend and co-eval Horace has grievously misstated matters upon which he professed to be informed'.

There are unfortunately other scholars who identify Glycera and Nemesis. So, to put the matter in a nutshell, I would challenge them, all and singly, to produce a single instance from ancient or modern literature in which the inamorata of any writer has in any published writing, and without an accompanying ex-

planation, been assigned any other name than that by which she was known to the public. When they have done so, they will have put themselves within the pale of argument.

It is possible to maintain, though Mr. Ullman does not maintain it, that, though the Albius of the ode is not Tibullus, the Albius of the Epistle (I. 4) may be. I have argued against this identification, op. cit. p. 182, and I have nothing to add here.<sup>1</sup> I am sorry to note that Mr. Ullman cannot see that there is a difference, and a considerable difference, between comparing the work of the chief elegiac poet of Rome whom his contemporary Marsus associated with Vergil to that of a Cassius Parmensis and doing the same for that of a 'rich literary amateur.' Even in jests proportion and *τὸ πρέπον* must be observed.

Mr. Ullman fills some five pages with an attempt to show that the description of Albius in the Epistle is appropriate to Tibullus. His interpretation appears to me fantastical. But I do not care to pursue it in detail. I will however give reasons for my judgment, so far as it concerns his exegesis of a single line: 'an *tacitum* siluas inter *reptare* *salubris*.' Mr. Ullman says that 'verse 4 shows what is the matter with Tibullus: *tacitum* shows that he is brooding, melancholy; *reptare* suggests the dragging steps of a dejected individual; *salubris* . . . suggests that Tibullus was looking for . . . mental health'. But *tacitum* does not mean 'brooding, melancholy,' but simply 'not inclined to talk', 'in mood for meditation, pensive, musing,' as it does at S. I. 3. 63. sq. 'simplicior quis et est qualem me saepe libenter | obtulerim tibi, Maecenas, ut forte *legentem* | aut *tacitum* impellat quo quis sermone' and so in the other place where Horace uses it, ib. 6. 123. Nor is there any more 'dejection' about *reptare* here than in Pliny Ep. 1. 24. 4 'scholasticis porro dominis, ut hic est, sufficit abunde tantum soli ut releuare caput, reficere oculos, *reptare* per limitem unamque semitam terere omnisque uiteculas suas nosse et numerare arbusculas possint', where it depicts the leisurely movement of a scholar who saunters or, if you like, potters about his little country estate. And it is perverse to limit *salubris* to the sense of giving 'mental health'. Though Albius might have 'ualetudo abunde', there was no need for him to risk it by strolling in insalubrious woods.

<sup>1</sup> It may be noted that both identifications are in Porphyrio's commentary.

To come to the next point, the actual evidence that our poet's name was Albius. It is of course possible to hold that it was, without holding that its owner was the Albius of Horace's Ode and Epistle. And those who do this will ask what testimony, independent of that identification, can be discovered. They will find the statement that he was thus called in three existing sources—Diomedes, Porphyrio and the anonymous *Vita Tibulli*. But they will also find that in the two first it is *coupled with the identification*, and that therefore, in our ignorance of the sources which these writers actually employed, we are not entitled to take for granted that it is independent of that identification. Whether Porphyrio, the elder of the two (though he cannot have lived earlier than the second century A. D.), made it himself, or derived it from others, we cannot tell, though it is at least a plausible conjecture that he got it from one of the literary busybodies 'who wrote on the characters of Horace' (Porph. on Sat. 1. 3. 21 and 91). The *Life* is left. As regards this Mr. Ullman says that I admit 'for the sake of the argument' that 'Suetonius is the ultimate source of this life' and he complains that 'this surprising generosity rather takes one off one's guard', p. 150. I will therefore take the opportunity of stating anew the impression which this document left and leaves upon my mind. It is that of a patch-work, with some bits older than others. Some bits look as if they were Suetonian in origin, and this they may be, although I cannot, even 'to shorten the discussion', admit that they *must*. Others again seem to belong to a much less classical period. In the first words of it 'Albius Tibullus', with which alone we are now concerned, there is nothing to indicate their source. Any-one who could decline a Latin noun might have written them. My 'generosity' then amounted to granting that the statement they contain *may* have come from Suetonius; but may equally well have come from some other, later or inferior, source. It was therefore 'necessary to examine the life itself before pronouncing on its credibility'. And I examined its contents with the result set out by Mr. Ullman (though he ought not to say that I attributed the identification of Albius with Tibullus to Suetonius). The analysis showed, and as far as I know Mr. Ullman does not dispute this, that the *Vita* contains nothing about Tibullus that its compiler might not have got from the use of sources which we have as well as he. It is quite useless to argue against this that *in other cases* we know that Suetonius had 'a

considerable amount of material which is not accessible to us'. What we are concerned with is Tibullus and Tibullus alone.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Ullman's argument raises the questions of the trustworthiness of Suetonius and his critical competence. If his reputation for either stood higher than it does, I might be tempted to examine it further. As it is, I will ask Mr. Ullman some questions about a passage in another literary life, believed to have come from the same pen, that should cause him some serious reflexion either on the credibility of biographers or on the sources and composition of 'Lives'.

The following sentence is from *Suetoni Vita Horati a Porphyrione commentario praemissa* (Vollmer Hor. p. 7):

Ad res uenereas intemperantior traditur, nam specula toto cubiculo dicitur habuisse disposita ita ut quocumque respexisset sibi imago coitus referretur.

I will ask Mr. Ullman to compare this statement about Q. Horatius Flaccus with the account given by Seneca N. Q. I. 16 of a certain Hostius Quadra, whose character was of such a kind that, when he was murdered by his slaves, Horace's intimate friend and patron Augustus declined to punish them; and then to say 1. whether he accepts the statement; 2. whether he believes that Suetonius wrote it; 3. whether he is now quite comfortable in his mind as to the value of 'Suetonian' or other identifications.

J. P. POSTGATE.

UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL, August, 1912.

<sup>1</sup> May I here explain why I have omitted 'Albius' from the title page of the editions of the whole or parts of the poet's works that I have published, so causing concern to some whom I am sorry to disquiet? I do not claim that I have shown that he was not called Albius: that is a negative which from the nature of the case it is impossible to prove. But, in view of the 'weighty reasons for doubting this statement' (Tibullus Selections, p. xviii), I felt that prudence demanded that he should be given only that name which was certainly his, lest the 'Albius' of current appellation and traditional biography should prove to have no better warrant than the 'Aurelius' which, itself the figment of an identification, disfigured, even in the edition of Lachmann, the title page of our poet's contemporary Propertius.

## VII.—REJOINDER TO MR. POSTGATE.

Gladly availing myself of the courtesy extended by the editor of this Journal, I shall reply to Mr. Postgate's remarks on my paper "Horace and Tibullus" (A. J. P. XXXIII 149 f.).

The main part of my paper—the interpretation of Horace's Epistle to Albius—Mr. Postgate scarcely touches upon. Many of his remarks are based, as I shall attempt to show, on misunderstanding of my words, due largely, it seems to me, to hasty reading on his part, and made easier by my intentional brevity in a portion of my paper that was, as I stated, chiefly introductory.

Mr. Postgate is inexact in stating that I "treat the proper name (Glycera) as a common one". I do not go so far, as my words show. The quotation from Cicero does not affect my point. It is true, Cicero and Mr. Postgate notwithstanding, that Gaia is commonly used in inscriptions merely to indicate that the person referred to without specific name is a woman and not a man; in fact, *mulieris* is sometimes used in exactly the same way.<sup>1</sup> So there is a general similarity between the use of Gaia and that of Glycera as I see it; i. e., Gaia stands to *mulier* about as Glycera to *meretrix*. Of course the similarity is only a general one, as I tried to indicate without lengthy explanation by saying that "the use of Glycera corresponds to that of Gaia". Mr. Postgate's argument concerning Richard Roe and Shylock seems to me irrelevant. I do not see what it has to do with the matter in hand, and can account for it only by supposing that in a hasty reading of my words he assumed that I meant that Glycera = mulier = Gaia. Mr. Postgate asserts that Latin has no means of distinguishing between 'Jehu' and 'a jehu' or 'the jehu'. But is this altogether correct? Latin can often distinguish by the context. And after all I do not maintain that Horace's use of Glycera is *exactly* like that of jehu. I did not think it necessary to state that in this phenomenon of making proper nouns common there were various degrees. The extreme stage would be the use of an original proper noun as a

<sup>1</sup> Cf., e. g., Egbert, Latin Inscriptions, p. 101.

common noun alone. Next would be its use as a common noun most of the time. *Jehu* is in this class perhaps. Then come various stages in which the proper name approaches a common noun in force, where it is a type-name. Here *Glycera* belongs. A closer English parallel than any I gave is *Hodge* (American 'Rube') in which the proper name has been almost completely sunk in the appellative—*caprimulgus aut fossor*. My idea as to *Glycera* is best indicated by the interpretation I gave of Horace's line—though of course Horace puts it much more tactfully—"Albius, do not grieve overmuch when you think of the bitter-sweet *Glycera*, for she is only a *meretrix* after all".

Perhaps, however, Mr. Postgate will not be satisfied without Latin parallels. I therefore append a few. The use, for example, of *Charybdis* as a general term for a monstrous female being, as in Horace, Carm. I. 27. 19, belongs to the same general phenomenon. So also Martial's *Penelope* *venit, abiit Helene* (I. 62. 6). But an exact parallel is to be found in the use of *Neaera* (one of the names, by the way, that Horace uses) by Prudentius *Περὶ στεφανῶν* IO. 239:

Fusos rotantem cernimus Tirynthium:  
Cur, si Neaerae non fuit ludibrio?

Contra Symmach. Or. I. 135 f.:

.... temulentus adulter  
Invenit . . . scortum . . .  
Hanc iubet assumptam . . . Neaeram  
Secum in deliciis fluitantis stare triumphi.

In the first passage *Iole* is contemptuously alluded to, in the second, *Ariadne*. On the first passage the Delphin edition has the note: *Neaera* communi vocabulo dicitur quaevis mulier lasciva et infamis. For *Glycera*, we may compare Ausonius, Epigr. 39 (18): *Laidas et Glyceras, lascivae nomina famae*. Horace, therefore, uses the term *Glycera* in place of *Nemesis*, not with the intention of naming the girl, but of characterizing her—in order to show *Albius* that she was not worth weeping over forever.

Horace uses the name *Glycera* four times. The reader may judge for himself whether I was justified in saying 'a number of times'. What is Mr. Postgate's minimum number for this phrase? I do *not* believe nor did I state that Horace always

uses the word *Glycera* as a *substitute* for the word *meretrix*. Even *Jehu* sometimes refers to the biblical character. I think, however, that in each case it is apparent that Horace uses *Glycera* as a *designation* for a *meretrix*. Thus, it seems to me, there is justification for the statement that *Glycera* is used by Horace as a class name. Mr. Postgate seems to believe that all four *Glyceras* were one and the same person. I certainly do not. Are we to assume that Horace and *Albius* were rivals for the same girl and that Horace was trying to persuade *Albius* to leave the field to himself? *Pholoe* and *Myrtale* are mere names too, and I distinctly called *Pholoe* a type-name. Does Mr. Postgate believe that all the persons mentioned by Horace under Greek names were real? In I. 17 *Cyrus* loves *Tyndaris*, in I. 33, *Pholoe*. Shall we write a biography of *Cyrus* and try to determine which sweetheart preceded the other? Shall we puzzle over the identity of *Opuntian Megilla's* brother?

Mr. Postgate attacks an ode of Horace as if it were a legal document: to him Horace either must mean just exactly what he says or must be convicted of perjury. Will this method of treating poetry find favor with admirers of the Odes? I gave reasons why Horace chose to use the name *Glycera* instead of *Nemesis* and to say *iunior* for *ditior*.<sup>1</sup> Mr. Postgate's challenge is impressive, but proves nothing. My whole point is that the name *Glycera*, with its connotation, is itself an explanation of Horace's failure to use the name *Nemesis*.

To support his assertion that my interpretation of Horace's Epistle I. 4 is fantastical, Mr. Postgate examines my treatment of a single line—a manifestly unfair procedure. I grant that a detail here and there in my treatment may not strike all as plausible, but that need not invalidate my interpretation as a whole—and it is this that is important. Let us see, however, how matters stand with regard to this line. Of course none of the words in it has the connotation I suggest in every passage in which it occurs. Few words have absolutely fixed meanings in themselves—context is very important. Mr. Postgate thinks that *reptare* here means the same as in Pliny, Ep. I. 24. 4: to saunter. But how does he know, except by the context, that it has that meaning in Pliny? I could quote plenty of passages in

<sup>1</sup> If my explanation does not please, one can still fall back on the defence that the rival may have been both richer and younger than *Tibullus*.

which *reptare* means to crawl—how can Mr. Postgate prove, except by the context, that Pliny does not mean that the gentleman crawls along on hands and knees—or on his paunch? As for *salubris*, Mr. Postgate's interpretation would make the word otiose and worthless in its context. I endeavored to explain *tacitum*, *reptare* and all the other words in such a way that they would form a harmonious conception. The only way in which my interpretation can be refuted is by offering a more plausible one for the whole poem, or by showing that I have given impossible meanings to words, or have failed to indicate the thought connections. Mr. Postgate does not say that the meanings I give to *reptare* and *salubris* are impossible. I am quite willing to admit that they do not always have the connotation I see in them in the Epistle.<sup>1</sup>

That Mr. Postgate believed that Porphyrio got his information from Suetonius seemed to me a fair inference from a reading of the first paragraph of page 180 of his "Selections", especially the last sentence: "We may thus dismiss Diomedes and Porphyrio as the historian of the Caesars is a much older witness". And, furthermore, if the author of the *Vita* derived his information from Suetonius, as Mr. Postgate assumed in his "Selections", and if, as Mr. Postgate believes, Suetonius used only the sources which we have, he must himself have identified Albius with Tibullus.

Mr. Postgate misinterprets my attitude towards the *Vita* and Suetonius. It was Mr. Postgate's *method* that I objected to. The impression that one is apt to get from this method of reasoning is 1) that the evidence of the *Vita* is much more important (being older in origin) than that of Porphyrio and Diomedes; 2) that this importance is nil; 3) that, therefore, Porphyrio and Diomedes are minus quantities. I would much prefer to have the *Vita* dismissed with the charge that it is late and worthless. Personally I do not feel at all sure, though I am inclined to that view, that it goes back to antiquity, much less that we can definitely assign it to Suetonius or any other individual. Even if it comes ultimately from Suetonius, it does not follow that it reproduces all that Suetonius wrote. But if we leave it out of con-

<sup>1</sup> When I say "tacitum shows that he is brooding, melancholy", I do not mean that tacitum means melancholy. As Mr. Postgate says, tacitum means "not inclined to talk", which shows, in this particular context, that Albius was melancholy.

sideration entirely, the question then becomes a plain one as to where Porphyrio got the identification. Mr. Postgate's explanation of its origin does not strike me as plausible.

So far as the present question is concerned I have no interest in Suetonius' credibility, and Mr. Postgate's diatribe against him is wasted. Nor do I follow the logic in the queries with which Mr. Postgate concludes. Supposing that we concede 1) that the statement which he quotes cannot be true, and that we agree 2) that Suetonius wrote it, how does that prove 3) that the identification of Albius and Tibullus is wrong?<sup>1</sup>

B. L. ULLMAN.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH.

<sup>1</sup> In his third query Mr. Postgate asks whether I am now quite comfortable in my mind as to the value of Suetonius *or other* identifications. The 'or other' is, unfortunately for his logic, an admission that I did not hold that Suetonius was the source of all our information. As a matter of fact, I do not know whether he was the source of any of it.

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

**Römische Säkularpoesie : Neue Studien zu Horaz' XVI. Epos und Vergils IV. Ekloge.** Von R. C. KUKULA. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1911. 97 pp.

Under the title 'Römische Säkularpoesie' Professor R. C. Kukula, of Graz, has set forth two new studies, on Horace's Sixteenth Epos and on Virgil's Fourth Eclogue.

His interpretation of the famous Epos is not very convincing. He finds that it is a satire on a political Utopia of that day, possibly a pamphlet directed against Antonius (who was suspected of a design to transfer the government from Rome to Alexandria). The description of the Blessed Fields is caricature, the treatment of the oracle in the closing lines (63-66) is all irony and satire. The chief model of the poem is the speech in the Iliad, B 110-141, where Agamemnon speaks only to try his men, while his friends speak to hold them back. It is Archilochian in tone, and it is a genuine 'iambus'. It even contains a couple of verbal echoes of Archilochus: the *ἀδύτατος* of line 34 comes from fr. 71 (31), and 'muliebrem tollite luctum' (39) is a translation of *τλῆτε γυναικεῖον πένθος ἀπωσάμενοι*, fr. 9 (55) 10. <But was everything 'Archilochian' necessarily satiric? And surely something should have been said about the ethical effect of Horace's unusual metre. >

Some of the arguments on which this interpretation rests need not be taken very seriously. For example, Horace could not have really expected, or wished, an affirmative answer to his 'sic placet'? (23); a serious proposal to leave his country would be inconsistent with his 'patriae quis exsul se quoque fugit'? (Carm. 2, 16, 19) and with his 'caelum, non animum, mutant', etc. (Ep. 1, 11, 27). <The inconsistency is not very obvious. > Again, 'pluraque felices mirabimur' (53) is inconsistent with the 'nil admirari' of Ep. 1, 6, 1. <As if Horace could not write anything, at any time or in any context, which would be inconsistent with what he had once written in the year 40. > The 'pii' of line 66 cannot be Horace's political party; 'dagegen protestieren ebenso seine Dichtung wie seine Philosophie (vgl. besonders die Episteln I, 6 und 11) und seine politische Gesinnung'. 'Me vate', in the same line, is irony; the oracle was not Horace's own, and, besides, educated men of Horace's day were skeptical about oracles and such things. '*Iuppiter illa piae secrevit litora genti*' (66) is *σαρκασμός*. Horace's conception of Roman 'pietas' may be seen in his Carmen Saeculare: 'Alme Sol, possis nihil

urbe Roma visere maius', and any different wish would be 'nefas'. 'Pii' (66), then is ironical, 'volate' (40) is 'schmählich', and there is something about as bad in the closing word 'fuga' (66). <But when did 'volare' become 'schmählich'? Catullus did not hesitate to say of himself and his friends (46. 6) 'ad claras Asiae *volemus* urbes'.> Even lines 35-36 are tortured into confessing their part in the general satire: 'auf diese salzige Flut und auf den Pfad, der uns die süsse Heimkehr wehren mag, lasst uns die Schritte lenken, die ganze fluchbeladene Gemeinde' ('haec et quae poterunt reditus abscindere dulcis | eamus omnis exsecrata civitas'). That is, 'haec' (35) refers to the 'salsa aequora' of line 34, and before 'quae' one should supply 'ea'—for Horace is thinking of the *θαυματάν* ὁδόν of Pindar, Pyth. 10. 29.

The interpretation of the Fourth Eclogue is equally novel—and equally unconvincing. That is, it is not a *λόγος γενεθλιακός*, but a 'hymnus' written in honor of Octavianus, an ἑγκάμιον 'Οκταβιανοῦ. It is an official 'praeludium' of the secular festival which was planned for the year 39, and it was probably written at Octavianus' command. The 'puer' of the poem is no other than Octavianus himself (who was then twenty-three years old). Virgil's model is Theocritus (xvi, xvii, xxiv), but he has also adapted to his purpose a Sibylline oracle then current, an oracle which plainly shows Jewish influence.

Professor Kukula removes lines 60-63 from the end of the poem, and inserts them between lines 25 and 26. This, he remarks, brings the poem into conformity with some of the Idylls of Theocritus and with sundry other ancient poems. He makes the Eclogue 'amoebaean' ('zwischen *vates* und Sibylle'); lines 1-3 form the prooemium; lines 4-10 and 18-25 (60-63) 26-45 are Virgil's version of a Sibylline oracle; lines 11-17 and 46-59 are sung by the poet in his own person. <He makes no comment on the fact that the rules of 'amoebaean' singing are less strictly observed than in Virgil's other Eclogues. >

Having thus assigned lines 8-10, 'tu modo nascenti puerō', etc., to the 'oracle', he insists that 'nascenti' does not necessarily refer to the year in which the poem was written. And he can see in line 48, 'adgredere o magnos (aderit iam tempus) honores', that the poet is not addressing a child, but a youth already mature enough for the 'cursus honorum' ('ein für den *cursus honorum* herangereifter Jüngling'). The 'puer' of the 'oracle', then, cannot be a child born in the year 40; he must have been immediately recognized as Octavianus, 'puer καὶ ἐξοχῆν' to the people of that day. Cicero had actually called him 'puer egregius' in a letter written in March, 43. Indeed, whom could Virgil have meant by the hero of his new 'saeculum', if not the 'puer divinus' of his First Eclogue? <But 'Tityrus', in the First Eclogue, does not call his benefactor 'puer divinus', or 'puer'; the only hint of his age is in line 43, 'hic illum vidi *iuvenerem*'.>

Unfortunately, some unprincipled person took liberties with Virgil's *τύχωμον* 'Οκταβιανοῦ, a few years after his death, and by cunningly changing the order of four lines, 'incipe, parve puer', etc., made it available for the propaganda for a different 'Erlöser'. Whether this was done in the interest of Pollio's son, Asinius Gallus, or in the interest of Christian proselytizing, it is hard to guess—and 'im Grunde recht nebensächlich'. The fact of the dedication to Pollio means little or nothing as to the identity of the 'puer'; the person really honored is a greater than Pollio. Its chief significance is that it shows how completely harmony had been restored by the Peace of Brundisium. For the Eclogue was written after the Peace of Brundisium, the Sixteenth Epoede, before that event. Neither Pollio nor Antonius could now be offended by a hymn in honor of Octavianus. <This prudently anticipates any such objection as was naturally raised to Professor Skutsch's discovery that the Sixth Eclogue is one long compliment to Gallus, though it is formally dedicated to Varus. >

In his discussion of the identity of the 'puer', Professor Kukula draws several impressive parallels between Virgil and other ancient poets, but the parallels are not always as complete as he implies. For example, in lines 60–63, 'incipe, parve puer', etc., Virgil's 'oracle' announces a sign by which 'der vom Schicksal bestimmte' founder of a better time may be recognized in the hour of his birth. Like 'der vom Schicksal erbetene *Torquatus parvulus*' (Catull. 61. 216 ff.) he is to smile at his parent. <But why assume that Catullus is thinking of the 'little Torquatus' at the hour of his birth? And where does Catullus say that he was 'der vom Schicksal erbetene'? > On p. 64 the passage about the smiling of the infant and of his parents is said to be modeled on Theocritus, xxiv 54–59, where the infant Heracles on the first day of his life ('am ersten Tage seines Lebens') laughs, and by his behavior makes his parents laugh. <But Theocritus does not say that the parents laughed. And he does not say that this midnight adventure took place on the first day of Heracles' life. If it had, how could his brother Iphicles have assisted at it—Iphicles who was 'younger by a night' (*νυκτὶ νεώτερος*)? Even if Professor Kukula does not shrink from an impossible translation of 'Ηρακλέα δεκάμηνον ἔόντα, he should not forget the little Iphicles. Yet on p. 65 he repeats his double misstatement: 'Wem eben die Eltern nicht wie einst dem kleinen Herakles gleich nach seiner Geburt zulachen', etc. > On p. 67 the key to the meaning of line 61, 'matri longa dece[m] tulerunt fastidia menses', is produced from the same Idyll (xxiv). That is, Theocritus emphasizes the fact that Heracles was born in the tenth month ('v. 31 δύψιγονον, vgl. 1 δεκάμηνον'). <But, whatever may be the meaning of δύψιγονον, this fact is not very clearly emphasized in δεκάμηνον—in its context. > On p. 68 there is a further comparison with Idyll xxiv. That is, as Virgil sings of the birth of a 'magnum Iovis incre-

mentum', so Theocritus speaks of the birth of Heracles. <But Idyll xxiv does not mention the birth of Heracles. >

On p. 69 great stress is laid on still another parallel with Theocritus. That is, line 3, 'si canimus silvas, silvae *sunt* consule dignae'—as Professor Kukula writes it—means, 'wenn ich vom Wald jetzt singe, so geschieht's, weil nur ein Wald sich für den Konsul schickt'. And it is definitely intended to remind the reader of Idyll xvii 9-12, "Ιδαν ἐς πολύδενδρον ἀνὴρ ὑλατόμος ἀλθὼν | παππάνει παρέβοτος ἄδην, πόθες ἀρξεται ἔργον" | τί πρῶτον καταλέξω; ἐνεὶ πάρα μυρία εἰπεῖν κ. τ. λ. <But this parallel is hardly close enough, or important enough, to justify a deliberate change in Virgil's text. Most students of the Eclogues will be content to think of 'silvestrem tenui musam meditaris avena' (i 2) or of 'nostra neque erubuit silvas habitare Thalia' (vi 2). To go to Theocritus for an explanation is to go farther and fare worse. >

Professor Kukula is convinced that Virgil's whole treatment of his oracle is determined by his desire to glorify Octavianus, and that therefore the allegory of the poem deserves a closer study than it has received in modern times. And having once begun to explain the allegory, he resolutely carries it through to the end. 'Tuus iam regnat Apollo' (10) must have suggested to contemporary readers the young Octavianus—who in the year 40 took part in a 'cena δωδεκάθεος' as Apollo (Sueton. Aug. 70). 'Patriis virtutibus' (17) could then be understood only of the Divus Iulius, and 'facta parentis iam legere' (26) would naturally suggest Caesar's own Commentaries. <Had the Gallic War taken its place as a First Latin Reader even in Virgil's day? > The parenthesis 'matri longa decem tulerunt fastidia menses' fits in with a statement recorded by Suetonius (Aug. 94. 4), 'Augustum natum mense decimo et ob hoc Apollinis filium existimatum'. 'Temptare Thetim ratibus' (32) means the struggle with Sextus Pompeius, who was then threatening the coast of Italy; 'cingere muris oppida' may refer to the military operations about Mutina and Perusia; 'telluri infindere sulcos' must refer to the agrimensores who were charged with assigning lands to the veteran soldiers after Philippi (!). 'Alter Tiphys' (34) perhaps means Brutus; 'delectos heroas' (35) must mean the slayers of Caesar—for does not Cicero call them 'nostros ήρωας', Att. xv 12. 2? Line 36, 'atque iterum ad Troiam magnus mittetur Achilles' manifestly refers to Antonius and his eastern tour after the battle of Philippi. And line 22, 'nec magnos metuent armenta leones', has more point when one knows that Antonius' σύμβολον was the lion. <Most of Virgil's readers must have expected something better than this, after his 'paulo maiora canamus'. >

This is a long review of a very small book, but its length is perhaps justified by the general interest of the subject. Perhaps it is only fair to add that some of Professor Kukula's arguments are much more impressive in his own periodic language than

when they are baldly stated by a frankly skeptical reviewer. He is rather fond of the old-fashioned 'omnibus' sentence—with long riotous relative clauses, and many parentheses and quotations imbedded even in these. Even after a long practice in reporting *Germanorum obscura reperta* for the readers of this Journal, I have found it hard at times to make out his precise meaning. Still, I have tried not to misrepresent or misquote. Perhaps his study of Virgil—like Tennyson's famous hexameters—is 'no worse than' some recent studies of the Eclogues that 'daring Germany sent us'. But neither is it any better, and, like them, it should be 'used with caution'.

W. P. MUSTARD.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

---

Centaurs in Ancient Art. The Archaic Period. By PAUL V. C. BAUR. Berlin, Karl Curtius, 1912.

This book is another illustration of the fact that cataloguing is one of the most important tasks of the archaeologist as well as the best training for him. Professor Baur's book is not a catalogue of any particular collection or museum, but of the various types of centaur from the earliest times down to the end of the archaic period, 480 B. C. Three classes are distinguished: centaurs with equine forelegs, centaurs with human forelegs, and centaurs with human forelegs ending in hoofs—the last type, an Aeolic invention, short-lived and represented by only eight examples (Nos. 318–326). The unique case of a statuette of a centaur with human hindlegs as well as forelegs (No. 300) is explained as a mere artist's whim. The examples are arranged according to locality and in chronological order, but groups are formed of various mythological subjects. In some cases monuments later than 480 B. C. have been included, where the types were important for an understanding of earlier times. The earliest representations, of which three are given, are in Babylonia, where they are either purely decorative or have power to ward off evil. In the Minoan monuments no centaur is found, strange to say. Not until the geometric period is the centaur introduced into Greece, derived probably from the Hittites, to whom Baur traces much oriental influence in the representation of centaurs, thinking that the Etruscan and Greek representations often drew directly from a common oriental source which was Hittite (cf. pp. 112, 119, 120, 121 et passim). In the early geometric period (900–750) the centaur has not yet mythological significance. By the end of the eighth century (cf. No. 203) we have the first mythological subject connected with the centaurs, and from that time on legends concerning the centaurs become more and more wide-spread,

until we have the stories of Heracles and the centaurs, the adventure with Nessus, which was very popular, Pholus welcoming Heracles, the opening of the *pithos*, Pholus entertaining Heracles, the centauromachy on Mt. Pholoe, the Thessalian centauromachy, especially the episode with Caeneus, Peleus wrestling with Thetis before Chiron, the wedding of Peleus and Thetis with Chiron offering congratulations, Peleus bringing the child Achilles to Chiron, Hermes bringing the child Achilles to Chiron, Chiron teaching Achilles to throw the lance, Chiron sacrificing, centaurs hunting, combat between two centaurs, and purely decorative centaurs. The exact origin of the centaur as well as the etymology of the word is not known, although Baur frequently speaks of the Hittites as the originators. But we cannot be sure of this until we know more about the Hittites. The main value of Baur's catalogue, aside from the fact that it is the first exhaustive study of the centaur in archaic art, consists in proving that the earliest type of centaur is not that with human forelegs, but rather that with equine forelegs—a statement repeated over and over again throughout the book. Both types were known to the Greeks from the beginning, and occur together on a geometric stamped gold band from Corinth (No. 5), for which, as well as for No. 199, a reference might have been given also to Furtwängler's *Kleine Schriften*, pp. 458 f. (pls. 15, 16).

The book is well illustrated with thirty-eight figures and fifteen plates, all good except fig. 17 and pl. iv, 308, which are not clear. Several unpublished monuments are included; that on pl. xiii, 219, with no acknowledgment to Maragliannis or the discoverers. Many reproductions are due to Dr. Sieveking of Munich, and considerable material was contributed by Professor Zahn, who had also made a collection of centaurs. It is remarkable that of the 326 numbers in the catalogue, over three-fourths are vases; and in discussing these Professor Baur has shown a thorough mastery of the history of Greek vase-painting and the various styles.

There are some points about which one might differ from Professor Baur, but the book is unusually free from errors of fact. The confusion of right and left, which is so frequent in archaeological publications, occurs often. A few instances which I have noticed are p. 32, No. 83, left hand for right hand; p. 33, No. 84, the one to the right, for the one to the left; p. 73, No. 191, right arm for left arm, and left arm for right arm; p. 82, No. 211, in first sentence, right for left and left for right; p. 85, No. 217, left for right hand and right for left; p. 106, No. 257, left hand for right hand; p. 122, No. 307, Baur has uplifted right and extended left arm, where the new catalogue of the vases in Munich, p. 103, has just the opposite, and the second centaur has a branch in his right hand rather than in the left; p. 75, second paragraph, the reference should be to p. 508, not 506; and for Hollaux read Holleaux, and or Homolle *bis* read Holleaux. Misprints also are rare, but

p. 65, l. 6, read *Monuments funéraires* for *Monuments funéraire*; pp. 66 and 74 *butt end* would be better than "but end"; p. 73 read Macdonald for MacDonald *bis*; and Babelon *Traité* ii, 1, p. 1115, for Babelon *Traité* p. 1115; p. 101 read about to receive for "about the receive"; p. 124, No. 308, the poor illustration on pl. iv seems to show that Heracles is not in the background and is not concealed by the equine back of the centaur; p. 124, No. 310, Heracles' right knee is almost touching the ground, rather than actually touching it; p. 129 read 'his arguments seem' for 'his arguments seems'. Despite some Germanisms (cf. p. 89, 'Rosette form'; p. 102, 'Herakles and Achilles episodes'; p. 135, cf. the many similar formations and 'the earliest centaur type', etc., all without even hyphens to connect them), and despite a few rather bad expressions, such as 'the equine legged centaurs', or 'the equine forelegged centaurs', or 'a human forelegged centaur', or 'the change from human to equine forelegged centaurs', or 'hind-and left foreleg' (cf. pp. 7, 76, 86, 89, 99, et passim), the book is very readable, considering that it is a catalogue, and extremely suggestive. It is right up-to-date, referring on p. 84 to the Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum for April, 1912, and to the fine new catalogue by Sieveking-Hackl, of the Münchener Vasensammlung. We should also prefer references to the second edition of Head's *Hist. Num.* (cf. pp. 72, 73, 83, etc.); and to Reinach, *Rép. Stat.* IV, pp. 320, 441; and for No. 21 we should like a reference to Nicole, *Cat. des Vases Peints du Musée Nat. d'Athènes, Suppl.*, No. 907. We should also like consistency in referring to plates, Arabic numerals now being used and Roman at other times; and the lack of consecutiveness in the numbers on the plates is confusing (so, for example, No. 311 is on pl. I, and No. 14 on pl. xii). Even the recent dissertation of Oelschig, *De centauromachiae in arte graeca figuris* (1911) was available, and on pp. 138 f. Baur gives his additions. Baur's list is unusually complete. I have noticed few omissions. Leroux, *Vases de Madrid*, p. 24; Reinach, *Rép. Stat.* IV, p. 441, 1; BSA XIV, p. 297; an inedited terra-cotta Centaur with human forelegs in Baltimore. But it would not be fair to continue such strictures. Professor Baur deserves praise for this excellent piece of research, and this catalogue should be in every library of archaeology and art and in every important museum. The price, ten dollars, which is too much for a book of only 140 pages and with no expensive reproductions, will prevent most private individuals from purchasing it. Let us hope that Professor Baur will continue this valuable study from archaic times down to the Roman period, and conclude with a good index, which is lacking in the present volume.

DAVID M. ROBINSON.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

NILSSON, MARTIN P. *Die Causalsätze im Griechischen bis Aristoteles. I. Die Poesie. Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache.* Herausg. v. M. v. Schanz. Heft. 18. Würzburg: Stuber. 1907.

A quarterly is not the best conceivable field for a philological tourney. There is too long an interval between thrusts, and in the present number I have tried to bring the contestants face to face, instead of separating them by a distance of three months. But in the case of Mr. Pearson's article on *ὅταν* causal, an adequate consideration of the scores of examples by which he has undertaken to fortify his position would require more space than is occupied by his paper, and I will content myself with a few remarks on the general topic; and as Mr. Pearson has made no reference to Nilsson's Causalsätze, Nilsson's Causalsätze will at least serve the purpose of a heading, although No. 18 of the Schanz Beiträge has already received a Brief Mention in A. J. P. XXVIII 354 ff.

Temporal particles lend themselves readily to the expression or intimation of causal relations. The chief causal particle in Greek is a temporal particle, *ἔτει*, *ἔτειδη*, and this takes up most of the space. 'Post hoc, ergo propter hoc', is good enough logic for unlogical Language, with a capital L. In fact, all temporal particles in Greek with present indicative are causal, not only *ἔτει* and *ἔτειδη*, *ὅτε* and *όποτε*, but temporal particles of limit. So *ἔως*. In Plat. Parmen. 135 D. (*ἔως ἔτι νίος εἰ*) *ἔως* is causal. 'While' English is 'weil' German. (A. J. P. XXVIII 355.)

As for *ὅταν* with the subj., the causal connotation, or, if you choose, explicative-causal connotation, does not give the slightest trouble, when the sentence is generic or futural; and the multiplication of examples is utterly needless. The trouble arises when we have to deal with a single definite situation, a situation in which we might expect *ὅτε* with the indicative. True, *ὅταν λέγην* in quotations is very common in later Greek (cf. Just. Mart., Apol. I, 38, 8; 48, 10, where I have several examples), and the natural cry is 'encroachment'. Natural, because the history of syntax is a history of encroachments. *μή* encroaches upon *οὐ*, *ἄν* the definite absorbs *κανεῖ* the indefinite, the dull accusative crushes out clinging genitive and airy dative, *ἀμφί* succumbs to *περί*, aggressive *εἰς* pushes its way into the domain of the peaceful *ἐν*, *ἐάν* with the subj. ousts *εἰ* with the subj., *ὅταν* with the subj. ousts *ὅτε* with the subj., and dominates futural and generic spheres. In later Greek *ἐάν* forces itself on the indicative, and there are freakish *ὅταν*'s with the indicative. No wonder, then, that when we find *ὅταν* with the subj. used where we expect *ὅτε* with the indicative,

the cry of encroachment is set up. And as the *ōrav* group is the only group regularly employed for all future relations—particular and generic—by reason of the exactness of its tenses, *ōrav* *ōpō* and *ōrav* *īdō* being used almost to the total exclusion of *ōre* *ōψōμai*, the encroachment of *ōrav* particular, so to speak, upon the sphere of the present is not inconceivable; but the trend of usage is too strong to admit such an extension in what one may still be allowed to call the classical period of the language, and the most familiar example is no example at all. For *ōrav* *λέγη* for *ōre* *λέγει*, if an encroachment, is an early encroachment, as Mr. Pearson has shewn; and may be explained without any extraordinary feats of mental posturing. In the first place, reference to a text involves the notion of recurrence; and in the second place, verbs of saying belong to a class of their own. *Nescit vox missa reverti*. The *ēπει πτερόειτα* continue to swirl about us. *τὰ δ' αἰτεῖ*, it is said of the oracles, *ζῶντα περιποτάραι*. Hence the frequency of the imperfect of verbs of saying, hence the inadmissibility of an aoristic imperfect (A. J. P. XXIV 180; XXIX 344), based on verbs of saying, which are notoriously exceptional; comp. if need be, Kühner-Gerth II 1, 144. So also the image of the present *λόγος* reaches into the future and we have *ōrav*.

As for the other examples, it may be well to see what Nilsson has to tell us in the above cited Causalsätze. Nilsson also recognizes causal *ōrav*, which is summarily dismissed by a competent critic, Hans Meltzer, in his Jahresbericht on Greek Syntax (1904-1910), p. 375, without argument. About *ōre* in Homer Nilsson does not go into great detail, because the subject of *ōre* in Homer had been treated exhaustively by Friedländer long before. Suffice it to say that Homer makes comparatively little use of *ōre* as a causal particle or as a particle with causal connotation, and no example is cited that falls under the head with which we are concerned here. According to Nilsson, Aischylos makes no use of *ōre* in a causal sense.

The trouble begins with Sophokles—a very breedbate in the matter of syntax, as all syntacticians know; and the great example of causal *ōrav* adduced by Nilsson is the notorious one in Ai. 137, cited by Mr. Pearson. The causal connotation is unmistakable, the case is a specific case, but the mood puzzles Nilsson, as it has puzzled others; and, unwilling to give up the rights of the mood, which would be appropriate only in a generic or futural sentence, he says that the causal connotation is faint, as if that helped matters at all. The difficulty would abide, if *ōrav* were only temporal. But as Nilsson takes his flight, he cites a number of passages from Sophokles which to his mind present similar difficulties: Phil. 519, 641, 903, 1080; O. T. 422, 618; O. C. [301] 659, 1218; Ant. 91, 424, 580, 1046, 1165; Ai. 392, 513; El. 696, 1056, 1299; and these may possibly furnish grist for Mr. Pearson's mill. To me they present no difficulty whatever. The *ōrav*'s are all generic or futural. The connota-

tion is the connotation of the English 'when', but one of them (O. T. 618) furnishes an apt illustration of the particular application of a general statement, of which I shall have something to say presently: *ὅταν ταχὺς τις οἴπιθουλεύων λάθρα | χωρῆ, ταχὺν δεῖ καὶ μὲ βουλεύειν πάλιν.* *ὅταν*, says Nilsson, with causal connotation occurs often in Euripides, but said connotation is faint. Still he cites a long string, among them Mr. Pearson's Ion 743. Pindar uses *ὅτε* as a causal particle, but no example of causal *ὅταν* is given. In Bakchylides *ὅτε* is always purely temporal.

In point of fact, Nilsson's treatise is chiefly concerned with *ἐπει* and *ἐπειδή*, and even there he ignores some important literature; and if this section of his study is intended to embrace all the poetical side, one misses Theognis and the Theognidea, in which I have found six or seven *ἐπει*'s and no *ὅτε*'s.

But it is unfair to judge a work by a section, and I turn to Mr. Pearson, who has given us something to think about, even if his treatment of the subject is not systematic. Unlike Nilsson, Mr. Pearson, with British downrightness, has no respect for the feelings of the subjunctive; and whenever a causal translation makes good sense, he assumes causal connotation, whether the sentence is generic or specific, though he is not satisfied with the coarse English 'because'—a dissatisfaction I myself have expressed. The multisignificant participle suits him better, and he takes refuge in the analogy of Latin *cum* w. subj., which the Romans used freely to supply the lack of participles in their translations and imitations of their Greek originals (A. J. P. IX 155-6). I will not reiterate the warning that translation is a fallacious test (A. J. P. XIX 231), nor repeat my protest against mixing up Latin subj. and Greek subj. (A. J. P. XXV 481, XXXI 112). The latest theory of Brugmann is that the Latin imperf. subj. is really an imperf. indic. (I. G. F. XXX 338), sad news for parallel-drivers.

Instead, then, of bewailing the perversity of my fellow-grammarians and the failure of my own protests, I shall be better employed in trying to find some way of meeting the conditions of the problem without sacrificing the meaning of the mood on the one hand, and the distinct connotation of cause on the other. I have, however, nothing new to suggest. The way is the way pointed out by Shilleto, as cited by Mr. Pearson, but some further road-building might be of service, although there is no more common phenomenon than the use of the generic when the particular is meant. To this category belongs the familiar phenomenon of the plural for the singular, of the generic *ὅτες* for the particular *ὅτε*, of *μή* for *οὐ* with relative and participle, of the ideal second person singular when the real second person is meant, and the individual *ἄνθρ* becomes a universal *ἄνθρωπος*. So the confidential *τοι* which appeals to humanity can be used in connection with an actual *σύ*. In leisurely discourse the process is spelt out. You argue from the universal to the particular.

You start with *éav* w. subj., and wind up with *el* w. indic. St. Paul uses Greek to some purpose when he says (Gal. 1, 8): *éav ήμείς ή ἄγγελος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ εὐαγγελίστηται παρ' ὁ εὐηγγελισάμεθα ὑμῖν ἀνάθεμα ἔστω*, and follows it up by the two-edged sword of *el τις εὐαγγελίζεται παρ' ὁ παρελάβετε ἀνάθεμα ἔστω*. In the *Midiana*, Demosthenes furnishes a fine example of a transition from a generic to a particular, as I have pointed out A. J. P. XXVIII 236, where I explain, I trust convincingly, the change from *δs* *āv* to *el τις* (D. 21, 139). There is an illuminating passage in *Dem. 40*, 1. It is the second speech against Boiotos. This second speech is not equal to the first, which is to my mind a crushing refutation of the charge that Demosthenes had no sense of humour. It may not be by Demosthenes, but like so many of the non-Demosthenean speeches in the *Corpus*, it is Attic to the core. *Πάντων ἔστιν ἀνιαρότατον*, says the luckless *Mantitheos*, *καὶ ἄνδρες δικασταὶ, ὅταν τις δύοματι μὲν ἀδελφὸς προσαγορευθῇ τινων, τῷ δ' ἔργῳ ἐχθροὺς ἔχῃ τούτους, καὶ ἀναγκάζηται πολλὰ καὶ θειὰ παθῶν ὑπ' αὐτῶν εἰσιέναι εἰς δικαστήριον*—a general proposition which is made to fit his own case, and then he goes on to say *δὲ νῦν ἐμοὶ συμβέβηκεν*. It is not necessary, however, to spell out the connexion so plainly. You may use *oīrives* *āv* with your eye on the villain. You may have a generic *ōtarv* when you mean a specific *ōte*, and the *δὲ νῦν συμβέβηκεν* may be supplied. As to the notorious passage in the *Aias* on which Mr. Pearson enlarges, the *πληγὴ Διός*, the *ζαμενὴς λόγος κακόθροος*, these, it is said, are disasters that carry with them no notion of recurrence. On the contrary, they seem to stand in distinct opposition to the preceding *σὲ μὲν εὐ πράσσοντ' ἐπιχαίρω*, which cannot be otherwise resolved than by *ōtarv εὐ πράσσοντς ἐπιχαίρω*, a genericconditional. The best solution seems to be the 'polare Ausdrucksweise', of which so much has been made of late (A. J. P. XXIV 361-2). But to go through every example of *ōtarv* with causal connotation that Mr. Pearson has cited would be a serious matter, and transcend the bounds of the present issue of the Journal.

B. L. GILDERSLEEVE.

Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen, von LUDWIG TRAUBE Herausgegeben von FRANZ BOLL. Zweiter Band, Einleitung in die Lateinische Philologie des Mittelalters, Herausgegeben von PAUL LEHMANN. München, 1911. C. H. Beck, pp. x; 176.

The editors of the unpublished lectures and treatises of Traube have acted wisely in publishing separately the lectures on mediæval Latin philology, even if they form a volume smaller in

size than that planned for the series. They have thereby made more accessible a book by a master-hand that fills a long-felt want, an introduction to a little-known period of literature, for the presentation of which the author was so peculiarly fitted. His publications and researches in diverse fields enabled him to speak with authority of the many problems which present themselves in a study of the transition from classical to mediaeval literature, and in the part the mediaeval period took in the preservation of the classical tradition. For those to whom the subject is new the book opens up unexpected perspectives, not only of a long neglected province of human interests, but also of the activity of modern scholars in exploiting it, as is evidenced by the well selected bibliography of the different phases of the subject. Those who are interested in any branch of mediaeval literature will find every page helpful and suggestive.

Traube (p. 36) emphasizes the fact that autograph copies of some of the most important mediaeval compositions have come down to us; he himself discovered some of the works of Johannes Scotus either in original manuscripts or in copies which had been studied and annotated by him. The sketch of Traube's uncompleted treatment of his discovery, prepared in 1905, has just been published by the Munich Academy in its *Abhandlungen* as the fifth part of his *Palaeographische Forschungen*, under the editorship of Professor E. K. Rand. The latter's own researches on the writings of Johannes (A. J. P. xxviii, 141) appear to advantage in the adequate introductory remarks on the twelve facsimiles which prove so well Traube's thesis. Meanwhile the series founded by Traube, *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters* keeps up its high standard. The first parts of the third and fourth volumes, *Franciscus Modius als Handschriftenforscher*, and *Johannes Sichardus und die von ihm benutzten Bibliotheken und Handschriften* are the first fruits of promising investigations of P. Lehmann. He has undertaken to study the work of the German humanists in discovering and using mediaeval collections of manuscripts. The author is contributing not only to the history of libraries and manuscript collections; he is perhaps doing more service in pointing out the original value of forgotten sixteenth century editions of classical and patristic authors, due to the large use of good manuscripts, now lost.

G. L. HAMILTON.

## REPORTS.

Glotta: II Band, 1910.

Pp. 1-8. J. Wackernagel, Zur griech. Wortlehre. 1) *ἀθληρός*, *ἀκνητής* (on Bechtel, Glotta I 71 f.). 2) *ἐνημάρ* (Critique of Brugmann I. F. 20: 225 ff.); the form is a "Zusammenrückung" of the numeral *τρι**τα* (more likely than *τρι**τε* with later synizesis) with the noun *ημάρ*, with which it originally formed a phrase. *ημάρ* could be plural, cf. *νύκτας τε καὶ ημάρ*. 3) *Μυρσάρ*. 4) *παιδίσκος*, *παιδίσκη*, *παιδίσκειον*. The masc. was probably Spartan, and "ausserhalb Lakedaimons haben wir keinen Grund, das lebendige Dasein dieses Masc. vorauszusetzen". (But cf. below, pp. 218 and 315).

Pp. 8-22. K. Witte, Zur homerischen Sprache. III. *ημιν* und *ιμιν*. Combats Sommer's view (Glotta I 219 ff.) that the *ι* was originally short. Finds that spondaic words tend strongly to be placed in the last foot of the hexameter, while trochaic words are generally placed in the interior of the verse and followed by another short syllable, so as to form dactyls. But out of 119 cases of *ιμιν* and *ημιν* in Homer 33 occur in the sixth foot and 78, in the interior of the verse, form spondees (whether followed by vowel or consonant), while only 8 cases of *ημιν* and none of *ιμιν* must be read as trochees! The occasional shortening of the *ι* is probably analogical to the (Aeolic) forms *ἄμμι(ν)*, *δημι(ν)*. These two forms occur 38 times in Homer; only 5 times in the 6th foot, and only once (*δημιν*) before a following consonant forming a spondee.

IV. Miscellen. a) *δδύναι* orig. plurale tantum; *δδύνη* (only twice) "Neubildung". b) *μένος* orig. singular.

Pp. 22-26. M. Niedermann, Kontamination bei Homer (cf. Glotta I 140 ff.).

Pp. 26-28. A. Meillet, Sur le digamma en pamphylien. On the different treatment of digamma in different positions; testimony afforded by different writings for surd and sonant digamma in Pamph.

Pp. 28-38. E. Fraenkel, Zur griech. Laut- und Formenlehre. I. Zum dissimilatorischen Silbenschwund. More cases of haplogly (Glotta I 272 ff.). II. Zum gen. pl. von *ιέρεια*. This plur. occurs once as *ιέρειῶν* in an Attic inscription. The Doric form introduced to differentiate *ιέρειῶν* from *ιέρειων*, gen. pl. of *ιέρευς*. (Rather simply an orthographic mistake?) III. Zur Dissimilation zweier gleicher Verschlusslaute.

Pp. 38-49. J. Janko, *Melca*. Name of a preparation of sour milk. Not of Germanic origin (Müllenhoff, Walde, et al.), but

an old popular Latin word (though not recorded in literature till 2d century A. D.). May have been originally loanword (Etruscan or Punic?), but probably connected with *mulceo* and meaning "gestrichene, geriebene Speise".

Pp. 49-51. ANDOVARTO (Gallic inscriptional name, see Rev. Celt. 23, p. 276), not goddess as Blanchet proposes, but name of a person, cf. ANDOVARTO CIL. V 5955.

Pp. 51-54. M. Niedermann, Vulgärlateinische Miscellen.

Pp. 54-56. F. Kluge, Nachlese zu Walde.

Pp. 56-75. F. Pradel, Bemerkungen zu der Sprache und Technik der römischen Daktyliker. I. *De:ex*. Even in classical prose the distinction between them breaks down, and in dactylic poetry they may be used interchangeably according to the demands of the meter. Copious illustrations of both in all sorts of phrases.—II. *Ex* und *in ordine*. Same principle applies; after long syllable *ex*, after short *in* (*ordine*). Similarly also III. *Imprimis* und *cum primis*.—Such considerations are of importance also in investigating later Roman prose writers, whose style was much influenced by preceding poets.

Pp. 75-81. F. Solmsen, Zu lat. *nūbō*. On Kretschmer's etymology (cf. Glotta I 325 ff.). Agrees with K. in separating *nūbō* from *obnūbō* and *nūbēs*, and finds additional ground therefor in different conjugation of *nūbō* (perf. *nupsi*) and *obnūbō*, perf. *obnūbi* according to the few cases which actually occur, though the lexica give *obnupsi*. Dissents however from K.'s idea that *obnūbō* is denom. from *nūbēs*; from an i-stem one would expect \**obnūbiō*. *Obnūbō* S. holds to be an old formation; connects it with Av. *snaoda*, etc.

Pp. 82-83. P. Kretschmer, Nochmals lat. *nūbō*. Comments on the foregoing; defends denom. origin of *obnūbō* from *nūbēs*; *nūbēs* was not felt as an i-stem for such a purpose as forming denominatives, and there was opportunity for influence of such analogies as *caedo* : *caedes*, etc.

Pp. 83-110, and 181-200. G. Herbig, Falisca. Grammatical conjectures dealing with the interpretation of certain "etrusco-falisca" inscriptions.

Pp. 111-12. E. Lattes, Per l'interpretazione dei numerali etruschi. "... malgrado le gravi obbiezioni forse non errano del tutto coloro che ragguagliano etr. *ci* a 'cinque'".

P. 112. O. Probst, 'Ἐπιγλωσσίς. Appears in a late Latin gloss in the form *ipiclo* (wrongly explained by Niedermann, Glotta I 261 as = *ἐπίπλοος*). Cf. below, p. 169.

Pp. 113-118. G. N. Hatzidakis, Über die Bedeutungsentwicklung des lokalen Suffixes *-θεν*. *-θε(ν)* originally local; could contain the idea of "where?" as well as "whence?" in

Homer and early inscriptions. It became appropriated to the idea of "whence?" presumably by extension from forms which contained the suffix and for other reasons had an ablative meaning.

Pp. 118-124. Nîkos A. Béng, Ueber die Konstruktion von *διαφέρειν* ("gehören") mit dem Genitiv. Occurs in grave inscriptions, mostly Christian, and once or twice in late writers. Due to contamination of phrases *μνήμα διαφέρον τῷ δεῖν* with *μνήμα τοῦ δεῖνος*.

Pp. 125-126. J. Compernass, Vulgaria. 1) Vulgar Greek and Latin are fond of substituting simple for compound verbs. 2) For *ἀπαξ*, *δίς*, *τὸ πρῶτον*, *τὸ δεύτερον*; *semel*, *bis*, *primum*, *iterum*, etc., late writers are fond of periphrases with forms of *φορά* and *\*viciis*.

Pp. 126-130. A. Fick, Urgriechisch. 1) *h* is certainly to be postulated in Urgriech. for IE. *s* between vowels and in combination with nasals and liquids. 2) *βαίνω* is not to be connected with IE. *✓g<sup>u</sup>em* (Skt. *gam*, etc.), but *✓βā:βā*, as *στā:στā*, found in Oscan *baīteis* "thou goest", and Lat. *bactere*, *bitere*.

Pp. 131-146. E. Nachmanson, Zu den neugefundenen Gedichten der Korinna. N. agrees with Wilamowitz that Korinna composed in her native Boeotian, with far less linguistic admixture of other dialects than Pindar for instance used; but thinks nevertheless that W. underestimates the amount of such admixture in Korinna, and finds specifically that she shows traces of influence from Lesbian lyric poets. So in *crasis*, *ā (ai) + ε* sometimes *> ā*, whereas *η* was regular in Boeotian.—As inf. endings, on the other hand, he regards both *-εμεν* and *-ην* (cf. *-ειν* in Boeot. dialect of the Attic comedians—not to be regarded as an Attic form) as native Boeotian.—For *κάρη*, *κάρας*, read *καρF-*; *F* after *λ*, *ν*, *ρ* never caused lengthening of the preceding vowel in Boeot. (as in Aeol. and Thess.).

Pp. 146-149. E. Nachmanson, Über die Apokope der Präpositionen im Böötischen. In original Boeot. *κατά* became *κατ* (with assimilation) before all consonants; IG. VII 524 *ΚΑΤΑΝ* is to be taken as *κα� (κατ')* *-γāν*. Double consonants are written as single in this inscription.

Pp. 149-151. E. Lidén, Ein aegyptisches Wort bei Hesych. *ρώνιξ*: *ποταμίας νεώς εἴδος*. Read *ρώμ-* for *ρώνi-*, and cf. the form *ρωμσις*, an Egyptian boat, Papyrus Louvre 10593.

Pp. 151-164. F. Skutsch, Quisquiliens. 1. Osk. *ekss*; adverb, in form nom. sg. masc. of pronoun; like Lat. *versus*, etc. 2. Nomin. *di*, dat. abl. *dis*; not contracted from *dei(s)* or *dii(s)*, but regular phonetic resultant of old forms *\*deivei(s)*, since Solmsen has shown that *v* may disappear between like vowels (hence never gen. sg. *\*di*, because orig. *\*deivi!*) 3) *alis*, *alid*; not old forms, found first in Lucretius; probably analogical to (*ali-*)*quis*, *-quid*. 4) Addendum lexicis latinis, *formitare*, *desid.*

to *formare* (Priapeum, Bährens P. L. M. II 160). 5) *patér* *matér*, *fratér*. Original vocatives used for nomin.; hence 6) Vokativ *puere* und Verwandtes; *puere* was the original voc.; *puer* (never as voc. in Plaut.) the nom. used by extension. 7) *Dignus*. Orig. p. p. p. to *decet* (cf. *plenus* : \**plère*), 'adorn' Hence the ablative: *dignus laurea*, 'adorned with laurel' 8) Ein Soldatenwitz. Suet. Tib. 42 'pro Claudio Caldius'; perhaps in vulgar-Latin of that time *al* was pronounced *au*; first literary testimony to this change is in Edictum Diocletiani, A. D. 301. 9) *ficus*; adjectives in this suffix frequent in Seneca as in the pre-classical tragedians, but not in intermediate poets. As connecting link Ovid's *Medea* is suggested. 10) *Officium* is for *opificium* and means "Tun, Werkum, regelmässige charakteristische Tätigkeit" rather than "duty" originally. (Against Brugmann, IF. 24: 165.)

Pp. 164-168. P. Friedländer, *Persona*. Almost certainly to be connected with *πρόσωπον*; probably also with Etrusc. *φερσυ*; both probably Greek loanwords, the Latin perhaps indirectly through the Etruscan, although the Roman tradition indicates that masks were first introduced from Campania rather than Etruria.

P. 169. M. Niedermann, *ἐπιγλωσσίς* or *ἐπίπλοον*? Reply to Probst, above, p. 112.

Pp. 169-181. C. F. W. Müller, Die Syntax des Dativs im Lateinischen. (Fragment published posthumously by Skutsch.) No local sense contained in the dative. "[Es] steht im Dativ derjenige Gegenstand, für den die Handlung oder der Zustand des Prädikats indirekt von wirksamem Einfluss ist, sodass sich auf ihn der Vorteil oder Nachteil der Handlung oder des Zustandes erstreckt". Detailed discussion of the usage with a large number of verbs.

Pp. 201-213. P. Kretschmer, Die Griechische Benennung des Bruders. The IE. word for brother, preserved in all other branches of the family, in Gk. occurs only with mg. 'tribesman', and is replaced by *ἀδελφ(ε)ός*, *(αὐτο)κασίγνητος*. Of these two the former certainly, and the latter probably, meant 'brother on the mother's side', though both have come to mean, even in Homer 'brother' in general. (*ἀδελφός*, -*φή* derived from *-φέος*, in principle as Wackernagel KZ. 27 : 263; *κασίγνητος* [like *κάσις*] shortened form of *αὐτοκασίγνητος*, for \**αὐτο-τεκασι-γνητος*, \**τεκασι* being IE. \**tek̥n̥t̥i*, fem. pres. ppl. = *τεκούσα*, cf. Wackernagel KZ. 33: 13 ff.) *φράτηρ* meant originally 'brother on the father's side', cf. *Zeus 'Απατούριος* = *Φράτριος*, and the 'Απατούρια named after him (< \**ἀπάτορες*, < \**λ-πάτρες*, 'having the same father'). *ἀδελφεός*, etc., then, meaning 'of the same mother', must have been introduced in conscious contrast to *φράτηρ*. The pre-Hellenic population of Greece, like the Lydians, etc., seem to have had succession in the female line; these words are a mark of the influence of the aborigines on the Hellenic language. After their introduction

*φράτηρ* came to be used in its socio-political sense, and was replaced by *ἀδελφεός*, etc.

Pp. 214-218. J. Brause, Dor. *λῆν*. The forms *λῶ*, *λῶν*, etc., with *ω* are not contractions of *\*λήω*, etc., but analogical to *τιμῶ* (<*τιμάω*), etc., as *λῆις* : *τιμῆις*, etc.

Pp. 218-219. O. Immisch, *Παιδίσκος* (to *Glotta* I 285 f., II 6 fl., and 130) occurs in *Herodas*; was literary usage already in Hellenistic Greek.

Pp. 219-230. R. Wünsch, *Amuletum*. Previous etymologies all unsatisfactory. May be a loanword, perhaps Etruscan; if Latin, must contain suffix *-ēto-*. In that case probably derivable from *amulum* = Gk. *ἀμυλον*, both in Lat. and Gk. familiar as a popular concoction of meal which when eaten had magical effect against all kinds of evils. The *amuletum*, according to Pliny, was at times something to be eaten. The suffix *-ēto-* has a like meaning in a number of other words.

Pp. 230-246. F. Skutsch, *Odium* und Verwandtes. *Odium* in early Latin means not 'Hass', but 'Widerwille'—'disgust'. True origin shown in key-passage, Pl. *Asin.* 927, where it seems to mean out-and-out "ill-smelling object". It is to be derived from *↙od* (*odor*, *oleum* <*\*odet*, *ஓδωδα*, etc.), and meant 'stench'. Collection of interesting parallels from many languages showing similar semantic developments. The verb *odi* likewise meant ('ich habe jemand gerochen') 'er is mir zuwider'. Like many or most verbs of smelling, the *↙od* was both trans. and intrans. originally; hence *osus* (p. p. p.) might mean 'smelling of'; and hence the suffix *-osus*, which in its oldest occurrences (*citrosam*, *hircosus*) may well be rendered by 'smelling of'. It probably originated in the elision of the ending of a preceding dependent accusative before the vowel of *osus*; *citr(um)osus*, etc. Spelling *-ossus* means no more than *caussa* for *causa*, etc.; *-onsus* for *-osus* occurs with certainty only in *grammonsus* (Caecilius once) and the frequent *formonsus*, which is either a mistake out-and-out, as *thensaurus*, *occansio*, *Herculens* (Terentius Scaurus forbids its use), or (Nachtrag, p. 246) the *n* is analogical to other words in *-onsus* (*intonsus*, *sponsus*). In any case *-ossus* and *-onsus*, are to be regarded as unoriginal. The semantic part of S.'s article is very convincing; the phonetic part also leaves little to be desired down to his treatment of *-onsus* and *-ossus*, which seem to the present writer after all not so easily to be brushed aside.

Pp. 246-247. E. Berneker, Anhang: Slavische Parallelen zur Bedeutungsentwicklung von *odi*.

Pp. 247-254. E. Vetter, Ableitung und Bedeutungsentwicklung von lat. *incolumis*. Difficulties in the way of making *in-* negative; no *\*columis* in existence, and connexion with *κολούω* or *clades*, *per-cello* scarcely possible. The word is to be connected

with *columnen*, *culmen*, *columna*, and means 'resting on its foundation', 'upright', 'steady'; opposed to *ruens*, *deiectus a culmine*, *prostratus*. Like *obvius* <*ob-viam*, *per-fidus* <*per-fidem*, this comes from \**in columine* (read *columnen* Pl. Trin. 743), with stem shortened as in *sublimis* <*sub-limine*. Early and Classical Latinity use the word most commonly in such connexions as Cic. Tusc. 1. 85 *incolumi regno*; of the state, civic prosperity, etc.

Pp. 254-257. A. Döhring, Lateinische Etymologien. 1) *nuncupare*, *nun* <*novem*, cf. *nundinae*: 'die neunsache Fassung des Gelöbnisses, die erforderliche, rituelle Wiederholung der Gelübdeformel'. 2) *insolens*: = (*insiliens* =) *insultans*, as suggested by gloss *adsolentes* = *adsilentes*. 3) *rigere*: 'starr, emporgerichtet sein', cf. *e-rigere* of the 3d conj. (as *pendere*: *pendere*, etc.)

Pp. 257-265. v. Grienberger, Oskisches. 1) Zu den *eituns*-Inschriften (cf. Skutsch, Glotta I 104-113). Holds to older interpretation of *eituns* as 3 pl. impv., 'man soll gehen'; inclines with Skutsch to connect the verb *saamat* with Lt. *fama*. 2) Zur Inschrift des Täfelchens von Agnone.

Pp. 265-269. E. Lattes, La compagna dell' iscrizione di Novilara. Rendic. Acc. Lincei, 1908, ser. V, vol. XVII, pp. 681-694. Inferences drawn therefrom as to points of Etruscan phonetics and morphology (loc. in -u, etc.).

Pp. 269-270. E. Lattes, Lat. *dossennus*, *maccus*, *persona*. Believes all three to be of Etruscan origin.

Pp. 270-287. P. Kretschmer, Zur Erklärung des sogenannten Infinitivus historicus. First gives a critique of a number of previous theories on the subject. I. Ancient theory of an ellipsis of *coepi*—renewed in very modern times by Jaenicke; besides the fact that ellipses are not in favor with trained modern grammarians, there are cases where no form of *coepi* would fit. II. Wisén conjectured a vulgar perfect \**amare* = *amarunt*, as *amavere* to *amaverunt*, which was confused with the inf.; usage then extended to *monere*, *dicere*, etc. But the hist. inf. commonly represents an imperfect, not perfect. III. Wackernagel held this to be an imperative inf., used for narrative tense, as the impv. in Slavic. But literary Latin knows no inf. for impv., and neither does any Latin know the Slavic usage of the genuine impv. as a narrative tense! Reference to a similar use of the inf. in Lithuanian is no explanation, since the Lith. usage is as unexplained as the Latin. In modern (and Middle High) German, on the other hand, as well as in Italian, French and other languages, K. points out closely similar usages; e. g. in 'Clärchen's Lied' from Egmont: 'Freudvoll und leidvoll, gedankenvoll sein' etc. He then shows very vigorously and convincingly that the inf. absolute, whether implying a statement or a command ('inf. for impv.') is nothing but a phase of the 'Nominalssatz' (Meillet's 'la phrase nominale'), the verbless

clause, which may appear in any language at any time. In short, it is a substantive-infinitive, really a noun and not a verb. There are, K. shows, in Latin, as well as in German, Italian, etc. cases where the proximity of a verb to which the inf. may vaguely be referred as subject or object make it a debatable question whether the inf. is absolute, or syntactically related to a neighboring clause. These are the transition cases which help to establish the free use of the indubitable inf. absolute. The present writer will quote from a story supposed to represent current theatrical American: "How goes it, old boy?"—Business of shaking hands.—'So-so, dear fellow'". I take it the phrase *business of shaking hands* represents an inf. absolute; it is felt more verbally than simply—'a handshake'. This latter one might have said, and it would have been the strict 'Nominalssatz', as Kretschmer shows, next-of-kin to the inf. abs.

Pp. 287-299. G. N. Hatzidakis, Zur neugriech. Wortlehre. 1) *Zωντανός* und Verwandtes. *ζωντανός* adj. <*ζῶντα*, stereotyped participle, 'alive'. Hence (among other forms) *τὸ ζωντόβολο*, *τὰ ζωντόβολα*, generally collective or plurale tantum, 'das Vieh'. -*βολος* as suffix frequently has collective meaning. Discussion of variations in the meanings of other Modern Greek suffixes, -*κόπος*, -*λόγος*, -*μάχος*, -*φόρος*, etc. 2) *\*Ἀρά* (for *\*Ἀραθά*), *θαρθαλαμίδι* (for *παραθαλαμίδιον*) usw.; by Kretschmer's law that an unaccented short vowel disappears after liquid or nasal if the neighboring syllable had the same vowel. 3) *κοριαννον* -*κολιανδρον* -*κόλιανδρον* (popular etymology). 4) *ξυρανδος* >*γαῦρος*. 5) *Διοσκύραμος* > *δίσκυραμος* and *βίσκυραμος* (popular etymology). 6) *θρασίμι*, *θράσος*, *θράστος*.

P. 300. W. M. Lindsay, *Hā = hāc* in Plebeian Latin. Suetonius ap. Isid. Etym. 18, 7, 9.

P. 300. G. N. Hatzidakis, Zu Glotta II 124. Critique of N. Béney.

Pp. 301-315. F. Solmsen, Ionische Verbformen bei Attikern. 1) *δεῖται* (*δεόμενον*) for *δεῖ* (*δέον*). The middle found in Hdt., Hippocrates, Herodas; in older Attic once each in Soph. (*Ιωνικώτατος* of the tragedians) and Plato, and repeatedly in Xen., who has quantities of Ionisms. The middle probably due to the influence of the personal *δέομαι*. 2) *ἐτράφθην*, *ἐτρέφθην*—*ἐτράπην*. The former originally Ionic, the latter Attic (preserved in Koine). Similarly *ἐκλέφθην* Ion.—*ἐκλάπην* Att. More complicated and uncertain S. finds other similar pairs, which he investigates in detail with quotation of passages—the aor. pass. of the verbs *πλέκω*, *κλέπτω*, *τρέπω*, *τρέφω*, *στρέφω*, *βρέχω*; in conclusion, however, he says, 'ich bin überzeugt, dass auch von den anderen Aoristparthen auf -θην und -ην so manche unter den hier ins Licht gerückten Gesichtspunkt Ionisch-Attisch fallen'.

P. 315. J. Wackernagel, Zu Glotta II 218. *παιδίσκος* is found,

though rarely, much earlier than W. supposed (II 6), and not necessarily under Laconian influence. Ar. Eccl. 1146.

Pp. 316-388. Literaturbericht für das Jahr 1908. Greek by Kretschmer; Italic by Skutsch.

Pp. 389-397. F. Skutsch, Lat. *praesto*. Walde's explanations, *\*prae-sito* "im Vorliegen, vorliegend" or *\*prae-situ* "vor der Lage" are semantically unacceptable. S. connects it with *praes*, bondsman, *praestare*, go surety for, and supposes that it is a stereotyped exclamatory phrase, *praes-sto!* 'I stand surety!' (According to Varro and Paulus the word *praes* was thus used in court proceedings by a bondsman; Mitteis independently conjectured that the full and formal phrase used was *praes sum*; Skutsch now suggests instead *praes sto*.) From this characteristic exclamation the *praes* himself was called *praesto*, as a kind of nickname in the manner of 'devil-may-care', etc.; and from the use of this form with the copula (this is the markedly predominant use of the adv. *praesto* in Latin) it became generalized into an ordinary adverb. The denominative verb *praestolari* is analogical to *stipulari*.

P. 398. P. Kretschmer, Silen. Σιλανός perhaps < Thracian Σιλας, wine.

P. 398. F. Skutsch, *Amuletum*. Note on Wünsch, p. 219 ff

Pp. 400-414. Indices by Kurt Witte.

FRANKLIN EDGERTON.

### PHILOLOGUS LXX (N. F. Bd. XXIV), 1911.

#### First Part.

I, pp. 1-51. W. Nestle, Spuren der Sophistik bei Isokrates. Isokrates, a pupil of Prodikos and Gorgias, assumes in his readers an acquaintance with the sophistic literature. In Panathen. 12, 2 he affirms that his early works are full of the artifices of the sophists. In order to separate these elements, we may use as a criterion the occurrence of a conceit in some admittedly sophistic writer of the 5th century, like Euripides. Thus we may perhaps augment the meager fragments of the sophistic literature and throw a side-light on the question of the historic fidelity of Plato's picture of the sophists. Gorgias exercised the greatest influence on Isokrates, as may be seen where he denies the possibility of an objective knowledge, defines rhetoric (Paneg. 8), declares that things are not *per se* good or bad, but become so by the use made of them (applied to rhetoric in Nikokles 3, 2 ff.; de Antidosi 15, 180 ff.); that rhetoric and poetry from their psychological effects should be put in the first rank; that the personified Logos is the

center of the highest culture; that philosophy has a certain pro-paedeutic value, etc. The influence of Protagoras may be traced in the making of *εἰθολία* the aim of rhetorical instruction; in Isokrates' position as to the relation of natural gifts and education; perhaps also in his discussion about primitive man, the development of civilization, forms of constitutions, and views about the gods.

II, pp. 52-98. R. Hildebrandt, Zu bekannten Stellen. I. Horace, Od. I, 3, 9, illi robur et aes triplex circa pectus erat. Circa pectus = in pectore, *ἐν στήθεσι*; the rest must refer to a 'block of oak enclosed in a triple casing of copper'. The vanquisher of the sea must have had in his breast not a human heart, but one like the hull of the vessel. II. St. Paul, I Cor. 13, 1, γέγονα χαλκὸς ἡχῶν ἡ κύμβαλον ἀλαλάζον; The 'sounding brass' is a synecdoche for any kind of vessel made of copper, which, when struck, would emit a sound, clear but not so crashing as the cymbal. III. Aetna, 244. Saturni quae stella tenax; tenax is active = hindering, delaying. IV. Verg. Aen. II 403. Cassandra is dragged from the temple *passis crinibus*, as she had gone there as a suppliant. V. Herodot. V 48. Kleomenes' Gorgo reflects in her name a prominent trait of her father. VI. E 842 οὐτοι δὲ μὲν Περίφαντα πελώπιον ἐξεράπισεν. Periphas is called a 'giant' because his name seems to mean 'visible on all sides'. Other instances of etymologically significant epithets are *tristior* Acheron; and Pyrrhus exultat (Aen. II 469); Πύρρος dances a *πυρρίχη* as it were.

III, pp. 79-105. F. Zucker. 'Επίτροπος Χαρτηρᾶς Ἀλεξανδρείας. In a dedicatory inscription (Klio X pt. 2) of an imperial freedman of the 2d century of our era appears the title 'procurator of the papyrus manufactured at Alexandria'. It seems probable that at this time the Roman government exercised a monopoly or at least an effective control over the production of papyrus in Egypt.

IV, pp. 106-145. K. Barwick, Zur Serviusfrage. Summary on p. 144. The supplementary scholia are derived from an ancient commentary on Vergil, which was put together about A. D. 500. Our enlarged manuscripts do not show the original form of the compiler's copy. The latter contained the several scholia, each with its Vergilian lemma but arranged regardless of their derivation from the one or the other commentary. The first copy underwent later changes, so that two scholia with the same or a similar lemma were combined into one, and those of the Servius Danielis were abbreviated; in some cases a number of extraneous scholia were substituted. On p. 145 is printed a stemma of the MS tradition. The additions to Servius seem to have been made in Ireland in the seventh century.

V, pp. 146-150. A. Semenov, Zur dorischen Knabenliebe. The good and bad sides must be kept distinctly apart. The

Greek states approved of the mutual association of men and boys for educative purposes, but certainly could never have officially sanctioned the degenerate practices of individuals, as Bethe contended (Rh. M. 62, p. 438 ff.). *dīras* is to be derived from *dīω*, to hear, with reference to the educative side of the association; and whatever may have been the later developments under oriental influences, the original conception was not bad.

VI, pp. 151-154. A. Ruppersberg. *Εἰσπνῆλας*. This discusses the same theme as the preceding article. R. denies Bethe's conclusion (in Rh. M. 62, p. 440) that the association, at least as Bethe understands it, was a "publicly recognized, holy, fundamental and vital element in Greek life". *εἰσπνῆλας* is the one who exerts moral influence, *dīras*, the one who hears.

#### Miscellen.

1, pp. 155-157. Eb. Nestle, Alpha und Omega, San und Sigma. (1) In Revelation 1, 8; 21, 6; 22, 13 the MSS write out *ἀλφα* but give merely *ω*. The explanation is that at the time the last letter of the Greek alphabet was called simply *ω*. The designation *ω μέγα*, and consequently the name omega, did not come in until later. (2) Classical philologists should more carefully examine Hippolytus, Philosophumena 6, 49, where stands a corrupt passage dealing with the names of the letters in *'Ιησοῦς* and *Χριστός* and their numerical values.

2, pp. 157-160. L. v. Straub, Ueber die Bedeutung von *λυστι-τελεῖν*. According to Diphilus (in Athenaeus, p. 227) a business is *λυστιτελές* if *αἱ πρόσοδοι λύνονται τάναλώματα*. In general this is true of the uses of the word: to recover the original outlay in business of any kind. It may also be compared as a synonym with the general idea of *συμφέρειν* yet it never evaporates into its general meaning. Cf. Plato, Alcibiad. C 10.

3, p. 160. J. Baunack, Noch einmal *ὑδάτη*. This form used in the Oxyrhynchos boat-song for the nom. and acc. *ὑδάτα* came from the use of *\*ὑδάτ-εσι*. *ὑδάτη* : *\*ὑδάτεσι* :: *γένη* : *γένεσι*.

VII, pp. 161-212. A. Roemer, Aristarchea I. The exegetical principle, "Ομήροις ἐξ Ὁμήρου σαφηνίζειν" and Aristarchus' attitude towards it. Another equally important principle was used by him in connection with it: *πολλά ἐστιν ἀπαξ λεγόμενα παρὰ τῷ ποιητῷ*, i. e. isolated facts occur in Homer, must be recognized as such, and may not be subjected to control through the rest of the Homeric poems. The principle is especially useful in investigating mythological matters, in which Aristarchus did not hesitate to avail himself of the principle of analogy; he placed interpretation *κατὰ μῦθον* on a sound basis. He interpreted Homer by the poet himself and also pointed out how Homer differed from later poets who dealt with the same materials. Many modern critics have misunderstood Aristarchus' real method of procedure. Continued in XII, pp. 321-352.

VIII, pp. 213-241. Th. Gomperz, Die hippokratische Frage und der Ausgangspunkt ihrer Lösung. The Greek text of the treatise "On Ancient Medicine" is printed (pp. 229-241); its relation to the citation in Plato's Phaedrus is discussed and the conclusions reached, that the treatise has not been highly enough valued; that it is improbable that a work cited by Plato, as a work of Hippocrates should have been lost; and even more improbable that this extraordinary treatise, by far the richest in ideas in the whole collection, striking a strong personal note, and containing as something quite new the theory of *κράσις* universally recognized as peculiarly Hippocratean, should be the work of an unknown author.

IX, pp. 242-266. W. Nestle, Gab es eine ionische Sophistik? An examination of certain passages in Herodotus and of what we know of his life shows that he made use of the older logographers and was acquainted with the teachings of sophists already well known to us. There is no chronological difficulty, and it would have been strange if Herodotus had ignored this great intellectual movement of his own time. There are no sure points on which to base the existence of an old Ionian sophistic.

X, pp. 267-273. R. Daebritz, Zu Asinius Pollio. Caesar's remark after the battle of Pharsalus is reported *ad verbum* in Latin by Suetonius, Vit. Caes. 30 on the authority of Pollio, and in Greek by Plutarch Caes. 46. The latter adds that Pollio said that Caesar uttered it in Latin on the memorable occasion; 'Ελληνιστι δ' ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γεγράφθαι. The words *ὑπ' αὐτοῦ* are shown to have referred to Pollio himself, who may have translated his Historiae into Greek or had them translated. When Pollio cited in Greek a famous Latin *mot* of Caesar's he felt it necessary to say that the Greek version was by himself.

XI, pp. 274-311, C. Ganzenmüller, Aus Ovids Werkstatt. Ovid's borrowings from earlier and contemporary Roman poets may be explained in various ways: (1) direct quotation was a sort of honorable mention; (2) many reminiscences are doubtless unconscious and due to Ovid's excellent memory; (3) just as the Roman poets exploited the Greeks, so too they had a habit of appropriating the best in their national literature; (4) as successive Roman poets sought to give technical perfection to the hexameter and pentameter, certain combinations of words became stereotyped and many beginnings and ends of verses constantly recur, and before the caesura and at the close of the pentameter the same words are used in a formulaic manner, just as in German, 'Sonne' and 'Wonne', 'Herz' and 'Schmerz' become almost inevitable rhymes; (5) the degree of imitation depended upon the character of the individual poet, and the attacks on Vergil by Octavius Avitus and Perellius Faustus show that a part of the Roman public protested; (6) Ovid had a knack of transforming his borrowings, but often metrical considerations

prompted the change. Numerous examples are given of Ovid's relation to Catullus, Tibullus and Propertius (pp. 279-309). He seems to have been naturally drawn closer to Tibullus than to Propertius. From the former he borrowed idyllic scenes and descriptions of nature, religious sentiments and lovers' arts and laments. From Propertius he derived much of his mythological lore, some of his references to the natural sciences, and to poets and their calling; also many of his far-fetched expressions. This article is concluded in XIV, pp. 397-437.

Miscellen.

4, pp. 312-313. J. Baunack, *Zur Inschrift des Argivischen Weihgeschenks des Kleobis und Biton in Delphi*. Assuming that plinth A had two lines running to the right, and plinth B two to the left, he would fill out the gaps thus [Κλέοβις καὶ Βί]· τὸν τὰς ματάρα | [Ηέραινδ] | ε ἄγαγον τοι δυγόν. From Herod. I, 31, one might conjecture [άπ' Ἀργεος Ηέραινδ]ε. Other spellings are suggested.

5, pp. 313-315. A. Zimmermann, *Randbemerkungen zum Fasciculus II des Thesaurus-Supplements*. (1) Latin names from the Greek of the type -ώ (gen. -οῦς). (2) Charitio (*Xapίτιον*). (3) Names from 3d decl. in -tas (-tatis) becoming VL -ta; e. g. Iulia Felicita. (4) For Celius verna Cellio (CIL II 5356) he would read: Celius vernacellio or Vernacellio (cf. rubellus, rubellio). (5) Cedatus is probably to be taken with CIL V 801 as referring to the gens Muicedatia.

6, pp. 315-317. W. A. Oldfather, *Ps.-Theognis Eleg. B' und die alte Komödie*. (a) Aristoph. Vesp. 1342 ff. is a parody of Eleg. B', 1361 f., *σχοινιον* = *πείσμαρος* in sensu obsc. (b) *κριθή* in the same sense, *άπαξ εἰρ.* in Aristoph. Pax 965 may perhaps be paralleled in Eleg. B', 1249 *κριθῶν ἐκορέσθης*. (c) *στάδιον* as a measure of speed (besides Aristoph. Ran. 91; Nub. 430) occurs in Eleg. B'. 1305 f.

7, pp. 317-320. H. Traut, *Horaz' Römeroden und der clupeus aureus* 6, 13 ff. des monumentum Ancyranum. The views of v. Domaszewski (Rh. M. 1904, 302 ff.) and Hiemer (Die Römeroden des Horaz. Progr. Ellwangen, 1905) that the poems were written to celebrate the erection in the curia Julia of the clupeus aureus (quem mihi senatum populumque Romanum dare virtutis clementiae iustitiae pietatis causa testatum est per eius clupei inscriptionem) receive corroboration from the reference to *anciliorum* in Ode III, 5, 8 ff. The golden shield was dedicated to Augustus in grateful remembrance of the legend of Numa Pompilius, "the prince of peace".

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

UNION COLLEGE, SCHENECTADY, N. Y.

## BRIEF MENTION.

In his article on the Trackers (*Ixneurai*) of Sophokles, in the *Revue de Paris* for August last, M. THÉODORE REINACH holds forth on the untranslatableness of Greek in the following terms;

Les poëtes grecs sont proprement intraduisibles, et Sophocle est peut-être le plus intraduisible de tous. Sa langue, tour à tour hautaine et familière, foisonnante d'images, dédaigneuse d'une syntaxe rigide, riche en néologismes hardis et en impropriétés géniales, s'accommode mal de la robe "tailleur", de l'allure sensée et correcte de notre prose française. Et comment rendre dans cette prose le souple balancement des trimètres, la variété expressive des rythmes lyriques—sans compter le charme à jamais évanoüi de la musique et de la danse, qui, dans une composition de ce genre, assez comparable aux comédies ballets de Molière, devaient constituer un des éléments essentiels de l'effet scénique?

The theme is not unfamiliar to the readers of the *Journal*, and the proof of the inadequacy of translation is an indispensable organon in the apparatus of every teacher. He who allows a student to rest satisfied with the dictionary equivalent of a Greek or Latin word is either shamefully ignorant or shamefully negligent. But it will be said 'The perfume is certain to escape, and all the lard of learning will not fix it'. Be it so. But translation is necessarily transformation, even such trans fusive renderings as have won unstinted admiration for Sir Gilbert Murray, admiration which even hardened specialists cannot withhold. The life of Greek is there, we are told, that immortal life. If that is Greek, Greek is worth while, and perhaps here and there a soul may be won to the study of the original; and so in time we shall have a revival of Greek studies in wider circles. And believing this, Grecians rejoice and honour the mission of the inspired interpreter, who has chosen with true insight Euripides as his subject—Euripides, so much nearer to us than Sophokles can ever be, for Sophokles is more remote from us than either of the other two. Yes, life is there, throbbing life, but the manifestation is something else. We oldsters have witnessed all manner of developments in fruits and flowers. Our day has beheld the wizardry of Burbank. It is a great thing to be the Burbank of Greek poetry. But the old Grecian turns from the seedless this and the thornless that to the native growth, the woods ever fresh, the pastures ever new, the Deer's Bill of Fare, the diet of the *Aïyes* of Eupolis (A. J. P. XXVIII 239).

Once in the Greek Anthology (A. J. P. XXXIII 227) it is hard to get out of it. When the flowers do not detain the reader, the critical thorns hold him like those that guard the ascent of

sunny Kronion at Olympia. One is tempted to emendation, one is tempted to translation—that very translation about which I have just echoed Reinach, and yet in that same article Reinach has translated a part of the *Iχνευταί*. And this reminds me that in justice to myself, as if that mattered, I ought to have accompanied my characteristic (A. J. P. XXXIII 112) of Cory's version of *εἰπέ τις Ἡράκλειτος* as a failure with some show of *raison démonstrative*. The famous version, an English classic, is contained in a little volume of poems printed without the name of the author at the Sunnyside (Orpington) Press in 1891. My copy was presented to me the same year by Edmund Clarence Stedman, and is thus doubly precious to me. The collection is called *Ionica*. I have renamed it *Ionia*, a much more fitting title for it than for the fraudulent *Violarium* of *Pseudeudocia* (A. J. P. III 489: IV 109; V 114 f.; VII 104). For those who do not know the poem by heart I will reproduce the text, so that the reasons for the judgment passed in the Journal may be intelligible, if unparableable:

They told me, Heraclitus, they told me you were dead,  
They brought me bitter news to hear, and bitter tears I shed.  
I wept as I remembered how often you and I  
Had tired the sun with talking and sent him down the sky.  
And now that thou art lying, my dear old Carian guest,  
A handful of grey ashes, long, long ago at rest,  
Still are thy pleasant verses, thy nightingales, awake,  
For Death he taketh all away, but these he cannot take.

To copy Bentley's famous dictum, 'A pretty poem, Mr. Cory, but you must not call it *Callimachus*'. It is much too puffy for that rather scrawny beauty; it repeats unnecessarily, it pads outrageously. The shift from 'you' to 'thou' can be justified by Shakespeare. A very pretty instance is to be found in *As You Like It*—the passage where Duke Frederick pronounces the sentence of banishment on Rosalind (Act V, Sc. 3). Cory's *Callimachus* gets tenderer as he remembers that he shall not see his friend again. Carian is a poor substitute for Halicarnassian. The Halicarnassians doubtless looked upon the Carians with some shade of contempt. *ἐν Καρί κινδύνος* is a sneering Greek proverb. And finally 'Still are thy pleasant verses' keeps us waiting too long. We think of 'still' = 'silent' before we get to 'awake', and we haven't to do with Wordsworth's 'still sad music of humanity'. 'Awake' and 'live' are not synonyms, as everyone who has preached and lectured knows. The stricture on 'Still are thy pleasant verses' has been pronounced by a judge of such matters hypercritical. But it so happened that this counter-criticism came to me as I was reading Hornung's 'Fathers of Men', a description of an English public school, which, to say the least, lacks the charm of 'Tom Brown'. In this book the task of translating Cory's *Heraclitus* into elegiacs is assigned to the hero, and this is what an accomplice makes of it:

Muta silet vox ista placens, tua carmina vivunt.

The joke (for it is a joke) is elaborately explained, as is the wont on the other side; but the possibility of the joke is the point, and I still think that the suspension of the sense is a serious drawback to the perfection of the poem.

---

The assaults upon the so-called Hegelian triads of Greek literature have not affected my equanimity in the least, nor do I repent me of my eidographic studies in Greek syntax (A. J. P. XXXIII 106). The very hopelessness of such a plan as applied to Latin is an added glory to Greek. The order of crystallization in Greek is the order of time, so that an eidographic syntax is to a certain extent a chronological syntax, and while chronology is not history, it is essential to history. In the series of *Columbia Lectures on Greek Literature* the traditional order is still observed, except that Oratory precedes Philosophy; and in the initial lecture by Professor SHOREY we read of 'the interest which attaches to the orderly sequence and full development of each distinct literary form or kind before we pass to the next', and that 'no secondary, imitative, and therefore partially artificial literature can exhibit this natural and artistic growth'. It is not likely, then, that the third generation, which I have been spared to see, will find the work that has been done on the old lines absolutely wasted; and in fact some of the leaders in syntactical research on the other side, such as MELTZER, seem to encourage the prosecution of eidographic studies—systematic studies, and not the sporadic observations of the old-fashioned *syntaxis ornata*. The long series of monographs over which Schanz presides gains new interest, one may say, new life, when examined from the eidographic point of view. The domain of Greek folk-speech, which is becoming crowded with workers, needs the markers that have been set up by the explorers of the literary field; and when an attempt is made every now and then to sum up results—such an attempt as IMMISCH's in the *Neue Jahrbücher* (XXIX, 1912, pp. 27-49)—the value of the preliminary eidographic studies becomes apparent. They teach us when the witness is speaking his native tongue, and when he is adorning his discourse with the floscules of the school (A. J. P. IX 154; XXV 106; XXX 105). So it is to be hoped that the effulgence of the new 'Light from the East' will not blind the student to the importance of the older study, for which so much remains to be done. The verb has yielded valuable results, but the noun presents some very preplexing problems to the students of eidographic syntax. The youthful botanist soon masters the phanerogams of his neighborhood, but the cryptogams will keep him busy long after he has pressed and labelled the rest of the flora. And the noun is the cryptogam of the syntactician. In the original draught of my Syntax the article with the genitive had its place side by side with the articular adjective; but the composite character of the genitive—a matter of common accep-

tation—gives an entirely different character to the problem, and the presentation had to be postponed until we could reach the section of the partitive genitive. The outside position of the partitive genitive, which is so regular a feature of the combination, forces the consideration of the conception of the case. Those who believe in the adverbial construction of the genitive as the primitive construction (A. J. P. XXIII 22) seem to consider the partitive notion basic. To my mind the partitive is a mere connotation of the adnominal or attributive genitive, fostered by the regular use of the genitive with parts of the body (A. J. P. XXIII 233; XXV 110). With the development of the article that connotation gets the reinforcement of position; so that we find a contest between the possessive and the partitive, in which the partitive sometimes gets the upper hand, e. g., *Pax* 880; *Ran.* 424. This is the reason why Professor Miller and I, after some hesitation, determined to postpone the treatment of the genitive in the articular complex until we came to the genitive itself.

'On relit comme Royer-Collard', I read not long ago in the *Mercure de France*, and recalling the fact that I had quoted the saying of Royer-Collard perhaps more than once, I thought to myself: Blessed is the man who hitches his name to an obviousness. There are thousands who know Royer-Collard by his innocent *mot*, as there are thousands who know the centenarian Routh as the author of that pregnant sentence, 'Verify your references'. Why, of all the old men that have uttered the natural sentiment of an aging scholar, Royer-Collard should have been immortalized by his version of the old saying: *On revient toujours à ses premières amours*; why Routh should have been selected as the exponent of the most elementary rule in the book-keeping of philology, passes my understanding, as it passes my understanding why CAUER in the new edition of his attractive book, *Grammatica Militans* (Weidmann), should persist in attaching the name of Kern to the division of the accusative into the Object Affected and the Object Effected, which I used with practised ease in my classes before the publication of my Latin Grammar in 1867. Where I got it from, whether I invented it, I do not care (A. J. P. XIV 375; XXII 28). In any case 1867 gives a terminus seventeen years farther back than CAUER's limit of priority, 1884. It is possible that I am the author of that particular tag, for tagging the phenomena of language is an amusing employment. How useful it is—ah! that is another matter; for after all the label may be false, and the old grammatical terms, which are as insignificant as proper names, ought not to be abandoned. But I watch the fate of my little things with a benevolent detachment. I was the first, I believe, to use 'articular infinitive'. The expression was ridiculed, and that is the reason why I remember my introduction of it. The American economy

of it has commended it to universal use. But I am not going to write a grammatical *Testamentum Porcelli*.

This incidental mention of the third edition of the *Grammatica Militans* must not betray me into a discussion of a book on which I could hold forth indefinitely. It is a bright book, the work of an experienced teacher accustomed to make points for his classes; an up-to-date book with references to the work of such Cis-Atlantic leaders as Hale and Morris, a book in which one reads of Meltzer (A. J. P. XXX 478) and finds summaries of Schlachter's statistics (A. J. P. XXIX 243; XXX 105); a book in which use is made of Stahl's collections and Stahl's psychology. Everyone can learn something from it, and I do not wish to play any longer the part of a *canis grammaticus* in the syntactical domain. The long growl with which I followed the track of Stahl has found but little echo, and yet as I turn over CAUER's pages I am tempted to apply the words of Rostand's *Patou* to this bright book, this up-to-date book:

Ces deux fléaux, qui sont les plus tristes du monde:  
Le mot qui veut toujours être le mot d'esprit,  
Le cri qui veut toujours être le dernier cri.

There are, it is true, many points in which my practice of more than half a century coincides with CAUER's teachings. But to cite only a couple of important points of hopeless dissidence. We approach the moods from opposite directions. To me *Will* is the *prius*, to him *Vorstellung* (A. J. P. XXXI 77). To me parataxis and hypotaxis are very much matters of style, whereas CAUER enlarges on the paratactic resolution of the hypotactic sentence, and fails to recognize the importance of the hypotactic sentence, which is older than our record, for the original meaning of moods and tenses (A. J. P. XXX 2). The subordinate sentence, as I have said (A. J. P. XXIX 268) is the Ararat in the flood of change, and I must confess that I look with amazement at the retention of Curtius' utterly unsatisfactory, utterly inorganic explanation of the acc. c. inf. in *oratio obliqua*, against which I protested years ago (A. J. P. XVII, 1896, 517): 'ἥγγειλαν ὅτι ὁ Κύρος ἐνίκησε becomes ᥥγγειλαν τὸν Κύρον ὅτι ἐνίκησεν, but ὅτι ἐνίκησεν = νικήσαι : ᥥγγειλαν τὸν Κύρον ὅτι ἐνίκησεν = ᥥγγειλαν τὸν Κύρον νικῆσαι. Q. E. D. To be sure, the *ὅτι* construction after verbs of saying is almost demonstrably younger than the acc. and inf. construction, and the acc. and inf. after *φημί*, the great verb of saying in the old times, could hardly have been suggested by *φημί ὅτι*, which is a tabooed construction (cf. A. J. P. XIV 374), but *ὅτι ἐνίκησεν = νικῆσαι* with the rest of it was too convenient' for men who treat language as if it were an equation in mathematics.

Another point I may be pardoned for mentioning. The regnant distinction between *el* c. f. i. and *ēār* c. subj., which I formulated many years ago, promulgated in 1876 (Tr. Amer. Phil. Assoc. for that year), defended in 1888 (A. J. P. IX 491), defended and, if I dare say so, substantiated in the Johns Hopkins University Circular for June, 1892, and in dephlogisticated form A. J. P. XIII 124—this distinction has found little favour, in fact, scant, if any, mention among German Hellenists. Outside of Germany the minatory and monitory formula has found wider acceptance, and has not been 'trotgeschwiegen' after the approved German fashion. CAUER seems to recognize the problem as a problem, but renounces the possibility of seeing after the distinction, if haply we may find it: 'Für den hellhörigen Hellenen wird zwischen *ēār* *ἀληθεύσης* (Anab. I, 7, 18) und *el* *ἀληθεύσεις* gewiss ein Unterschied gewesen sein; wir müssen wohl darauf verzichten, ihn nachzuempfinden'. With us who cannot talk with the ancient Greeks, it is a matter of sight, not hearing; and a bitter critic of America and Americans has made the important concession that Americans think straight and see clear, to which I would add that we do not always need German spectacles; and as I send this page to the printer I note in the new treasure trove, the *Iχνευταί* of Sophokles, two flagrant examples of the minatory condition col. vii 2: *el* *μὴ . . . ἐξιχνεύσεις* and col. x 21: *el* *φανταίρει* (cf. A. J. P. XIII 503).

'Interesting and suggestive, if not convincing' is a convenient formula of which I have made frequent use in passing judgment on others, especially in the domain of conjectural emendation, in which, to be frank, somebody, if only the author, ought to be convinced (A. J. P. X 87); and I was amused to find that this same convenient formula was commended to my own lips the other day in the latest volume of the *Harvard Classical Studies* (XXIII) by MARGARET C. WAITES, *The Allegorical Debate in Greek Literature* (p. 6) with reference to my interpretation of the riddlesome close of the Second Pythian. In this judgment she had been preceded by Nairn in the *Classical Review* for June, 1901, who says of my interpretation, 'Interesting but not convincing'. In his second edition of the Olympians and Pythians Fennell says, 'It is ingenious but thoroughly unsound'. Much more bearable all this than Bornemann's criticism in his triturating review of my Pindar, *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, 1885, No. 26, Sp. 308, where he cites this interpretation as one of the very few original things in the book, translates it to shew its absurdity, and calls it 'zugleich charakteristisch und verfehlt'. 'Der unbefangene Leser', he goes on to say, 'wird verwundert sein. Aber ich darf ihm und dem Herausg. zum Troste bekennen, dass solche Monstra in der herrschenden Pindarexegese nicht vereinzelt dastehen'. But since then Wilamowitz has disposed of

Bornemann in a single contemptuous sentence which has ground him to a finer powder than my Pindar furnished to his pestle. 'Puderet me mei ipsius si Bornemannis aliquid persuadere vellem' quoth Wilamowitz. And I said to myself in the language of Kydemos, ἀπόλωλ' Ἀθηναίοισιν δλεριβανος, though, to be sure, the parallel is unfair to Kleon. The fact is, I was not very much in love with my interpretation; and acting on my own principles, I ought to have suppressed it. The reason why Plato excepts Pindar from his censure seems to be that he is not dramatic. ἀφηγηματικὰ μέν, says Nicolaus Sophista in Rh. Gr. III 455, (Sp.) ὅσα ἀπὸ μόνου τοῦ ἀπαγγέλλοντος προσώπου εἰσίν, οὐα τὰ παρὰ Πινδάρῳ, to quote the first authority that comes to hand. But does this exclude self-dialogue such as we find in Homer? See Mure's Literature of Greece II. 14, 1, quoted by Campbell, Theaet. 190 A. However, I was quite aware of the audacity of my construction of the scene, and before publishing it submitted the case to a literary friend for the sanity of whose judgment I had great respect; and when he declared that he saw nothing absurd in it, nay, that it gave a rational explanation of the difficult passage, I greatly dared. Of course, I might have strengthened my position by adducing the puzzling shifts of Persius and Browning's parenthetic injections; but I have a certain reverence for Pindar, none whatever for Persius, and as for Browning I have already shewn that I am not in the least disturbed by the high and mighty prophecy he uttered in 1872, saying, 'Nor do I apprehend any charge of being wilfully obscure, unconscientiously careless, or perversely harsh'. The 'unconscientious carelessness' (A. J. P. XXXII 485) has been proved beyond question, as well as the 'wilful obscurity' with which he veils his indecencies (A. J. P. XXXI 488). No, I am not going to resort to Persius or Browning for the defence of Pindar, or rather of my interpretation of the Second Pythian. Since the publication of my Pindar the discovery of Bakchylides (A. J. P. XVIII 493) has given a specimen of dramatic dialogue in the Θησεῖς, to say nothing of the assaults that have been made on the Hegelian triad. We know nothing whatever about the delivery of the epinikia. A change of voices may have made the matter plain in the delivery. And a few years after the publication of my Pindar much attention was paid to the dramatic element in the Songs of Degrees. See Johns Hopkins University Circular, Feb., 1892, where we read, 'There are two voices in the opening verses of Psalm cxxi. The poet personates first a skeptic, then a believing Jew'—a perfect parallel to the Pindaric passage. I will not adduce the two voices in Ecclesiastes inasmuch as the second voice, according to Professor Haupt, is a later introduction. 'The genuine portions of Ecclesiastes', he says, 'are Sadducean and Epicurean. Stoic doctrines are found almost exclusively in the Pharisaic interpolations'.

H. L. W.: Many a traveler in a foreign land has proved to his satisfaction that ability to use the language of the country means a real saving of his resources. That this applies to books as well as to countries is evident from the increased price of the translation of MARUCCHI's *Epigrafa Cristiana*, the Italian original of which was noticed in this Journal (XXXI 368). The English version, a very satisfactory piece of work, is made by J. ARMINA WILLIS, and published by the Cambridge University Press (1912: 460 pp., with 30 plates. Price 7/6 net). From the typographical point of view the new edition, printed in somewhat larger type than the old, is even more attractive, though marred too often by errors due to proof-readers whose knowledge of Italian or of antiquity was inadequate. A distinct improvement, however, might have been made if the two pages of addenda to the Introduction, instead of being placed at the end, had been incorporated in the text at the appropriate places or even in foot notes.

Those who desire to study seriously any phase of Roman antiquity ought to make themselves sufficiently familiar with Italian to have no need for such translations. In this country at least students who find a foreign language an insuperable barrier to their studies are a small and steadily diminishing number; if they are really numerous elsewhere, the reissue of MARUCCHI's excellent little book in its English dress will prove to have been abundantly justified.

C. W. E. M.: The Archaeological Institute of Moscow has lately undertaken the publication of a valuable collection of facsimiles of dated Greek minuscule manuscripts. The editors are professors G. CERETELI of the University of Jurjev and S. SOBOLEVSKI of the Imperial University of Moscow. The object of the work is to furnish practice material for beginners and to make accessible to students palaeographical treasures with which even the trained expert has hitherto had but slight acquaintance. The collection is to consist of two parts. The first part (*Exempla Codicorum litteris minusculis scriptorum annorumque notis instructorum*; Volumen prius, Codices Mosquenses; Mosquae, Sumptibus Instituti Archaeologici Mosquensis, 1911; Leipzig, in Commission bei Otto Harrassowitz; Price, 40 marks) contains 43 plates of folio size, and 15 pages of descriptive and explanatory letter-press. The second part, which is to comprise facsimiles of Petersburg MSS, still awaits publication.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 30-32 W. 27th St., New York, for material furnished.

### AMERICAN AND ENGLISH.

Allen (B. M.) and Phillips (J. L.) Latin composition. Rev. ed. Boston, *Allyn & Bacon*. 10+266+28 pp. 12°, \$1.

Hale (W. G.) First Latin book. Rev. ed. Boston, *Atkinson, Mentzer & Co.* 20+340 pp. il. 12°, \$1.

Haverfield (F.) The Romanization of Roman Britain. London, 1912. 8°, 3s. 6d. net.

Homer. The Iliad; tr. by G. Chapman. New York, *Scribner*. 700 pp. 11. 16° (Caxton ser.), \$1.25 net.

— The Women of the Iliad; by H. W. Taylor. New York, *Broadway*. 60 pp. \$1.

— Homer's Odyssey; line translation in the metre of the original by H. B. Cotterill; with 24 il. by P. Wilson. Boston, *Estes*. 23+334 pp. 8°, \$5.50 net.

Howe (G.) Latin sight reader. Raleigh, N. C., *Thompson Pub.* 8+87 pp. 12°, \$1.50.

Leaf (W.) Troy. A study in Homeric Geography. London, 1912. 422 pp. 8°, 12s. net.

Loeb Classical Library. Greek and Latin texts with parallel English translations.

Greek. Appian. Vol. I. Apollonius Rhodius. 1 Vol. Euripides. Vols. I and II. Philostratus. 2 Vols. Sophocles. Vol. I. Theocritus, Bion, Moschus (The Greek Bucolic Poets). 1 Vol. Apostolic Fathers. Vol. I.

Latin. Cicero. Vol. I. Terence. 2 Vols. Propertius. 1 Vol. St. Augustine. 2 Vols. *Macmillan*. Cloth, \$1.50 net; leather, \$2 net.

Philostratus. Apollonius of Tyana; tr. by J. S. Phillimore. In 2 v. New York, *Oxford University Press*. 128+141; 296 pp. 12°, \$2 net.

Plutarch. Plutarch's Nicias and Alcibiades; newly tr., with introd. and notes. New York, *Scribner*. 11+335 pp. front. 8°, \$2 net.

Rolfe (J. C.) and Dennison (W.) A junior Latin book. Rev. ed. Boston, *Allyn & Bacon*. 6+396+164 pp. col. pl. maps, plans, 12°, \$1.25.

Sonnenschein (E. Adolph.) A new Latin grammar. New York, *Oxford University Press*. 266 pp. 12°, 60 c.

Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta papyracea nuper reperta; recognovit brevique adnotazione critica instruxit Arthurus S. Hunt. New York, *Oxford University Press*. 12° (Oxford classical texts), pap., 60 c. net.

White (J. W.) The Verse of Greek Comedy. London, 1912. 8° 12s. net.

Wilson (J. Cook). Aristotelian Studies: On the Structure of the Seventh Book of the Nicomachean Ethics, Chapters I-X. New York, 1912. 103 pp. 8°, \$1.25 net.

## FRENCH.

Borneeque (H.) et Mornet (D.) *Rome et les Romains*. 87 ill. et cartes, in-18. *Ch. Delagrave*. br., 3 fr. rel., 3 fr. 50.

Cavaignac (Eugène). *Histoire de l'antiquité*. T. II. Athènes (480-330 pp.), plans et cartes, in-8°. *Fonfemoing et Cie*. 12 fr.

Collinet (Paul). *Etudes historiques sur le droit de Justinien*. T. I. Le caractère oriental de l'œuvre législative de Justinien, in-8°. *Larose et Tenin*. 10 fr.

Fougères (Gustave). Athènes. 168 grav., in-8°. *H. Laurens*. br., 4 fr.; rel., 5 fr.

Meunier (Jean-Marie). *Index lexicographique de tous les mots celtiques, grecs, latins, etc., contenus dans la Monographie phonétique*, in-8°. *H. Champion*. 10 fr.

Reinach (S.) *Cornélie ou le latin sans pleurs*, 1 pl. 14×12, rel. *Hachette et Cie*. 5 fr.

— *Répertoire de reliefs grecs et romains*. T. II. Afrique. Iles Britanniques (x-546 pp.), in-8°. *E. Leroux*. 10 fr.

## GERMAN.

Arbeiten, Jenaer historische. Hrsg. v. A. Cartellieri u. W. Judeich. gr. 8°. Bonn, *A. Marcus & E. Weber*. 3. Heft. Robinson, Walt.; Marius, Saturninus u. Glaucia. Chr. (134 S.) 1912. 4.

Belzner, Homerische Probleme. Ü. die Komposition der Odyssee. (viii, 272 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1912.

Capelle (Wilh.) Zur meteorologischen Literatur der Griechen. (Progr.) (24 S.) Lex. 8°. Hamburg, (*Herold*), 1912.

Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du musée d'Alexandrie. 35,5×25,5 cm. Leipzig, *K. W. Hiersemann*. Vol. 57. Breccia (E.) *Iscrizioni greche e latine*. Nos. 1-568. (xxxi, 275 S. m. Abbildgn. u. 61 Taf.) *Le Caire*, 1911. nn. 52.

— général des antiquités égyptiennes du musée de Caire. 35,5×25,5 cm. Leipzig, *K. W. Hiersemann*. Vol. 58. Maspero (Jean). *Papyrus grecs d'époque byzantine*. Tome I. 2. fasc. Nos. 67,089-67,124. (S. 125-283 m. 10 Taf.) *Le Laire*, 1911. nn. 32.15. Vol. 59. Smith (G. E.) *The Royal mummies*. Nos. 61,059-61,100. (vii, 118 S. u. 1 Bl. m. Abbildgn. u. 103 Taf.) *Le Caire*, 1912. nn 61.60.

Catulli, Tibulli, Propertii carmina, a M. Hauptio recognita. Ed. VII ab Iohanne Vahleno curata et a Rudolfo Helmio ed. (871 S.) 16°. Lipsiae, 1912. Leipzig, *S. Hirzel*. 2.80; geb. 4.

Chledowski (Casimir V.) Rom. (II.) Die Menschen des Barock. Aus dem Poln. v. Rosa Schapire. (v, 549 S. m. Taf.) gr. 8°. München, *G. Müller*.

Ciceronis orationum scholia. Recensuit Thom. Stangl. Vol. II. *Commentarios continens*. (352 S.) gr. 8°. Vindobonae Lipsiae, 1912. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*. Vol. 1 (not yet published). 22.

Codices greci et latini photographice depicti duce. Scatone de Vries. 47+37 cm. Leiden, *A. W. Sijthoff*. Tom. XVII. Cicero: *De natura deorum, de divinatione, de legibus*. *Codex Heinsianus* (Leidensis 118) phototypice ed. Praefatus est O. Plasberg. (xiv S. u. 204 S. in Phototyp.) 1912. geb. in Halbldr. nn 225.

Commentationes philologae Ienenses, ediderunt seminarli philologorum Ienensis professores. gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. Vol. IX. fasc. II. Lammert, Frider. *De Hieronymo Donati discipulo*. (75 S.) 1912. 3.20.

Corpus inscriptionum etruscarum. Vol. II. Post obitum Paulii adiutoris Bartholom. Nogara edd. Olavus Aug. Danielsson et Gust. Herbig. Sect. II. fasc. 1 cur. G. Herbig. (S. 1-116) 39,5 × 28,5 cm. Leipzig, J. A. Barth. 1912. 36.

Erbe, Das, der Alten. Schriften üb. Wesen u. Wirkg. der Antike, gesam. u. hrsg. v. O. Crusius. 8vo. Dietrich. 5. heft. Steiger (Hugo). Euripides. (vii, 124 S.) 1912. 2.50 geb. 3.50 in Perg. 6.

Euripides, Des, ausgewählte Tragödien, erklärt v. N. Wecklein, 11. Bdchn. Die Schutzflehdenden. (X, 72 S.) 8°. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1912. 1.60; geb. in Leinw. 2.

Gleichen-Russwurm (A. v.) Elegantiae. Geschichte der vornehmen Welt im klass. Altertum. (xvi, 526 S.) 8°. Stuttgart, J. Hoffman. 1912. 8.50.

Gleye (Arth). Kretische Studien. Die westfenn. Inschrift auf dem Diskus v. Phaestos. (47 S. m. 1 Taf.) Lex 8°. Tomsk. 1912. Leipzig, O. Harrassowitz. nn 10.

Hermann (Eduard). Griechische Forschungen. I. Die Nebensätze in den griech. Dialektinschriften. (viii, 346 S. m. 2 Taf.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1912. 10 m.

Horati Flacci (Q.) carmina recensuit Fridericus Vollmer. Ed. maior iterata et correcta. (viii, 404 S.) kl. 8°. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1912. 2.40; geb. in Leinw. 2.80.

Kukula (R. C.) u. Schenkl (H.) Meisterwerke der Griechen u. Römer. In kommentierten Ausgaben. 8°. Wien, K. Graeser & Co. ill. Jurenka (H.) Römische Lyriker m. griechischen Parallelen. 2, verb. Aufl., besorgt v. J. Mesk. Text u. Kommentar. 2 Hefte. (72 u. 92 S.) 1912. 1.60.

Laudien (Arth.) Griechische Inschriften als Illustrationen zu den Schulschriftstellern. (78 S. m. Abbildgn.) 8°. Berlin, Weidmann, 1912. 1.40.

— Griechische Papyri aus Oxyrhynchos. Für den Schulgebrauch ausgewählt. (viii, 58 S. m. Abbildgn.) 8°. Berlin, Weidmann, 1912. 1.40.

Livi (Tit.) ab urbe condita libri. Editionem primam curavit G. Weissenborn. Ed. altera, quam curavit G. Heraeus. Pars V. Fasc. II. Liber XLI-CXLII. (xx, 244 S.) kl. 8°. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1912. 2; geb. 2.40.

Maass (Ernst). Goethe u. die Antike. (xi, 655 S.) gr. 8°. Stuttgart, W. Kohlhammer. 1912. 12; geb. 14.

Norden (Fritz). Apulejus v. Madaura u. das römische Privatrecht. (vi, 196 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1912. 6; geb. in Leinw. 8.

Plautus, Des T. Maccius, ausgewählte Komödien. Erklärt v. Jul. Brix. 3. Bdchn. Menaechmi. 5. Aufl., bearb. v. Max Niemeyer. (v, 108 S.) 8°. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1912. 1.60; geb. in Leinw. 2.

Prittowitz-Gaffron (Erich v.) Das Sprichwort im griechischen Epigramm. (vii, 68 S.) gr. 8°. Giessen, A. Töpelmann, 1912. 2.40.

Rank (Otto). Das Inzest-Motiv in Dichtung u. Sage. Schaffens. (viii, 685 S.) gr. 8°. Wien, F. Deuticke, 1912. 15.

Roemer (Adph.) Aristarchos Athetesen in der Homerkritik. (xii, 528 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1912. 16.

Rothe (Carl). Der augenblickliche Stand der homerischen Frage. (94 S.) gr. 8°. Berlin, Weidmann, 1912. 2.

Schlageter (J.) Der Wortschatz der ausserhalb Attikas gefundenen attischen Inschriften. (104 S.) gr. 8°. Strassburg, K. J. Trübner, 1912. 3.

Schwarze (Kurt). Beiträge zur Geschichte altrömischer Agrarprobleme (bis 367 v. Chr.). (xi, 87 S.) gr. 8°. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 1912. 2.80.

Sihler (E. G.) C. Iulius Caesar. Sein Leben, nach den Quellen kritisch

dargestellt. Deutsche, vom Verf. selbst besorgte, bericht. u. verb. Ausg. (viii, 274 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1912. 6; geb. in Leinw. 8.

Thomas (Emil). Studien zur lateinischen u. griechischen Sprachgeschichte. (143 S.) 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1912. 4.

Untersuchungen, Philologische, hrsg. v. A. Kiessling u. U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. 21. Heft. Dittmar (Heinr.). Aischines von Spethos VIII 328. gr. 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*.

Vitruvii de architectura libri decem. Ed. F. Krohn. (xi, 291 S.) kl. 8°. Lipsiae, 1912. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. 4.60; geb. in Leinw. 5.

Xenophon's Schrift *Ἱερὶ ἵππων*, verdeutscht u. m. Anmerkgn. versehen nebst e. Übersicht üb. die bisher. Übersetzgn. v. Erwin Pollack. (Progr.) (38 S.) Lex. 8°. Meissen, *L. Mosche*, 1912. b 1.40.

#### ITALIAN.

De Simone Brouwer Francesco. La Grecia moderna: raccolta di scritti neoellenici. Serie II. Napoli, 8°, p. 108. 6.

Papiri greci e latini. Vol. I (n. 1-112). Firenze, 8°, p. xiv, 227, con 13 tav. 30.

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

Baehrens (W. A.) *Beiträge zur lateinischen Syntax.* Leipzig, *Dieterich'sche Buchhandlung*, 1912. 9 m.

Baur (Paul). *Centaurs in Ancient Art: The Archaic Period.* With 38 illustrations in the text and 15 plates. Berlin, *Karl Curtius*, 1912. 40 m.

Bright (James W.), and Ramsay (Robert L.) *Notes on the 'Introductions' of the West-Saxon Psalms.* Extract from the *Journal of Theological Studies*, July (1912), Vol. XIII, No. 52.

Bryant (E. E.) and Lake (E. D. C.) *An Elementary Greek Grammar.* New York, *Oxford University Press*, American Branch. 60 c.

Burnam (John M.) *An Old Portuguese Version of the Rule of Benedict.* *University of Cincinnati Studies*, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1912.

Burchinal (Mary C.) *Hans Sachs and Goethe. A Study in Meter.* (Hesperia, No. 2). Baltimore, *The Johns Hopkins Press*, 1912.

Cohen (D.) *De Magistratibus Aegyptiis externas Lagidarum regni provincias administrantibus.* *Gravenhage apud L. Levisson* (1912). 8 m.

Cooper (Lane). *Ancient and Modern Letters.* Phi Beta Kappa Address, Cornell University. Reprint from *South Atlantic Quarterly*, July, 1912.

Cory (Herbert E.) *Spenser, the School of the Fletchers, and Milton.* University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. 2, No. 5, pp. 311-373, June 17, 1912.

Descartes, *The Philosophical Works of.* Vol. I. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1912. \$2.50.

Dihigo (Juan M.) Rufino J. Cuervo, *Estudio Crítico.* *Revista de la Biblioteca Nacional*, Habana, 1912.

Dodgson (E. S.) *The Baskish Verb.* London, *Henry Frowde*. New York, *Oxford University Press*, American Branch. \$4.00.

*Eastern and Western Review.* June-November, 1912. Boston, Mass., I, T. Timayenis. @ 20 c.

Ellis (Robinson). *The Amores of Ovid. A Lecture.* London, *Henry Frowde*, 1912. 1s.

English Dictionary (Oxford). Ed. by Sir James A. H. Murray. SENATORIAL-SEVERAL. Vol. VIII. By Henry Bradley. SLEEP-SNIGGLE Vol. IX. By W. A. Craigie. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*, Oct. 1, 1912. (@ \$1.25.

Erskine (John). *The Kinds of Poetry.* Reprinted from the *Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods*, Vol. IX, No. 23, Nov. 7, 1912.

Fay (P. B.) *Elliptical Partitiv Usage in Affirmative Clauses* (Johns Hopkins University Dissertation). Paris, *Honoré Champion*, 1912.

Greek Literature. A Series of Lectures delivered at Columbia University. By Paul Shorey, H. W. Smyth, E. D. Perry, J. R. Wheeler, Ed. Cappa, B. Perrin, C. F. Smith, F. J. E. Woodbridge, H. W. Prescott, Gonzalez Lodge. New York, *Columbia University Press*, *Lemcke & Büchner*, 1912. \$2.00.

Haas (G. C. O.) *The Dasārūpa: A Treatise on Hindu Dramaturgy*. By Dhanamjaya. Now first translated from the Sanskrit with the Text and an Introduction and Notes. Columbia University, Indo-Iranian Series. Ed. by A. V. W. Jackson. Vol. 7. New York, *Columbia University Press*, 1912. \$1.50.

Harrison (E. S.) *An Elementary Spanish Reader*. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1912.

*Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*. Vol. XXIII. Cambridge, Mass., *Harvard University*, 1912.

Hazeltine (Horace). *The Confession of a Neurasthenic*. New York, *Hehmeyer*, 1912.

Hebbel (Friedrich). *Auffassung vom Staat und sein Trauerspiel* (Agnes Bernauer) von Elise Dosenheimer. Untersuchungen z. neueren Sprach- u. Literatur-Geschichte. Herausg. von Professor Dr. Oskar F. Walzel. N. F. Heft XIII. H. Haesel Verlag in Leipzig, 1912. 4.60 m.

Hendersen (W. F.) *The Ballad in Literature*. Cambridge, *At the University Press*. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1912. 40 c.

Hermann (Eduard). *Über die Entwicklung der litauischen Konjunktionsalsätze*. Jena, *Buchdruckerei*, 1912. 2 m.

Hermes. Herausg. von Friedrich Leo u. Carl Robert. XLVII. Band. 4. Heft. Berlin, *Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung*, 1912.

Herodotus: A Commentary on. With Introduction and Appendixes by W. W. How and J. Wells. In Two Volumes. Vol. I (Books I-IV); Vol. II (Books V-IX). Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1912. 7s. 6d.

Hourwich (Isaac A.) *Immigration and Labor. A Summary*. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1912.

Hübner (Rudolf). *Einige Gedanken über unsere Universitäten*. Rostock, *Adlers Erben*, 1912.

Hrdlicka (Ales). *Early Man in South America*. Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology. Bulletin 52. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1912.

Jones (H. Stuart). *Companion to Roman History*. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1912. \$5.00.

*Journal of the American Oriental Society*. Ed. by J. R. Jewett and Hans Oertel. Thirty-second Volume. Part III. Sept., 1912.

Kellogg (Robert J.) *Studies in Linguistic Psychology*. Vol. I, No. 2. James Milliken University, Decatur, Ill., 1912.

Kern (Otto). *Nord-Griechische Skizzen*. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1912. 3 m.

Klio, Beiträge zur alten Geschichte. Herausg. v. C. F. Lehmann-Haupt u. E. Kornemann. Zwölfter Band. Heft 3. Leipzig, *Dieterich'sche Buchhandlung*, 1912. Per ann. 25 m.

— Zehntes Beiheft. Stech (Bruno). *Senatores Romani qui fuerunt inde a Vespasiano usque ad Traiani exitum*, Leipzig, *Dieterich'sche Buchhandlung*, 1912. geb. 12 m.

Lee (D. R.) *Some Relations of the Liberal Arts to the Modern Industrial Movement*. President's Address, Tennessee Philological Association, Feb. 23, 1912.

Leo (Friedrich). *Plautinische Forschungen*. Zweite Aufl. Berlin, *Weidmann*. 11 m.

Lesquier (Jean). *Les Institutions Militaires de l'Égypte sous les Lagides*. Paris, *Ernest Leroux*, 1911.

Livy, Book I. Ed. by H. G. Edwards. Cambridge, *At the University Press*. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1912. \$1.10.

Lessons in English. By John M. Manly and Eliza R. Bailey. Book I: Language Lessons. Book II: Composition and Grammar. Boston, *D. C. Heath & Co.* 45 & 60 c.

Lingua Latina. *Primus Annus*, By W. L. Paine and C. L. Mainwaring. Latin by the 'Direct Method'. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, 35 West 32d street, 1912. 50 c.

Maryland Geological Survey. Prince George's County. Lower Cretaceous. Vol. 9. Baltimore, *The Johns Hopkins Press*, 1911.

Mazon (Paul). Hésiode, La Composition des "Travaux et des Jours". Extrait de la Revue des Études Anciennes, Tome XIV, 1912, n. 4.

Mélusine: Recueil de Mythologie, Littérature Populaire, Traditions et Usages. Fondé par H. Gaidoz et E. Rolland, 1877-1887. Publié par H. Gaidoz. Tome XI. Avec une table générale de la collection (I-XI). Paris, *H. Welter*, 1912. 20 fr.

Μελέτη (H.) Μηνιαίον δημοσίευμα. Τεύχη 3-8 Μάιος-Οκτ. 1912. ἐν Ἀθήναις 1 δρ.

Meyer (Eduard). Histoire de l'Antiquité. Tome Premier. Traduit par Maxime David. Paris, *Genthner*, 1912.

Miller (C. W. E.) *τὸ δὲ in Lucian*. Extract from Transactions of the American Philological Association, Vol. XLII, 1912.

Negelein (Julius von). Der Traumschlüssel des Jagaddeva: Ein Beitrag zur indischen Mantik. Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche u. Vorarbeiten. XI. Band. 4. Heft. Begründet v. A. Dieterich u. R. Wünsch: herausg. v. Richard Wünsch u. L. Deubner. Giessen, *Töpelmann*. New York, *Stechert & Co.*, 1912. 17 m.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. deutsche Literatur u. für Pädagogik. Herausg. v. Jo. Ilberg u. Paul Cauer. Fünfzehnter Jahrg. XXIX. u. XXX. Bandes 8. u. 9. Heft. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1912.

Neuphilologische Mitteilungen. Nr. 5/6. Helsingfors, 1912.

Nutting (H. C.) A First Latin Reader. New York, *American Book Company*, 1912.

Oldfather (W. A.) New Manuscript Material for the Study of Avianus. Extract from Transactions of the American Philological Association, Vol. XLII, 1912.

Oliphant (Samuel Grant). American Surnames of Hellenic Origin. Proceedings of the American Philological Association, Vol. XLII, 1912.

Papyrus Grecs. Publié sous la Direction de Pierre Jouguet. Avec la collaboration de Paul Collart, Jean Lesquier, Maurice Xonat. Tome II, fasc. II, III, et IV. Institut Papyrologique de l'Université de Lille. Paris, *E. Leroux*, 1912.

Plutarch's Nicias and Alcibiades. Newly translated, with Introduction and Notes, by Bernadotte Perrin. New York, *Charles Scribner's Sons*, 1912.

Πρακτικὰ τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἐταιρείας τοῦ ἑτοῦ 1911. Ἀθήνησιν, 1912.

Practical English Composition. By C. M. Gerrish and Margaret Cunningham. Boston, *D. C. Heath & Co.*, 1912.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Herausg. v. August Brinkmann. N. F. LXXVII. 3-4. Frankfurt a/M, *Sauerländer*, 1912.

Ridgeway (William). Three Notes on the Poetics of Aristotle. The Classical Quarterly, Oct., 1912.

Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias. Universidad de la Habana. Vol. XIV.-XV. Núm. 1-3. Mayo, Julio de 1912.

Robertson J. G. Goethe and the Twentieth Century. Cambridge, *At the University Press*. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*. 1912. 40 c.

Rolfe (John C.) Research in Classical Philology. Old Penn, Vol. XI, No. 3. Philadelphia, Oct. 12, 1912.

Shakespeare Myth (The). By Sir E. D. Lawrence. London, *Gay and Hancock*, 1912.

Shorey (Paul). The Study of Greek Literature. Reprint from Greek Literature. New York, *Columbia University Press*, 1912.

Sihler (E. G.) C. Julius Caesar: Sein Leben nach den Quellen kritisch dargestellt. Deutsche Ausgabe. Leipzig u. Berlin, *B. G. Teubner*, 1912.

Skeat (W. W.) The Science of Etymology. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1912. \$1.50.

Stark (A. R.) The Christology of the Apostolic Fathers. (Ph. D. Diss.) Chicago, *University Press*, 1912.

Thomas (Emil.) Studien zur Lateinischen u. Griechischen Sprachgeschichte. Berlin, *Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung*, 1912. 4 m.

Tolman (H. C.) The Recently Found Aramaic Papyrus Fragments of the Behistan Inscription. Extract from the Proceedings of the American Philological Association, Vol. XLII, 1912.

Van Deman (Esther Boise). Methods of Determining the Date of Roman Concrete Monuments (First Paper.) American Journal of Archaeology, Vol. XVI (1912), No. 2.

Wars of Greece and Persia: Selections from Herodotus in Attic Greek. Ed. by W. D. Lowe. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1912. 60 c.

White (John Williams). The Verse of Greek Comedy. London, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1912, 12s.

Wood (Henry). Faust Studien: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis Goethes in seiner Dichtung. Berlin, *Georg Reimer*, 1912.

## INDEX TO VOL. XXXIII.

---

Accusative of Object Effected, 488	BLOOMFIELD, MAURICE. Instability of Moods in Earliest Sanskrit, 1-29
Achaeans, Ionians and, 221	Boeotian, Apocope of Prepositions in, 475
Adam's Vitality of Platonism and Other Essays (rev.) 91-95	BOLLING, GEORGE MELVILLE. Contributions to the Study of Homeric Metre, 401-425
Aeneid, Magic in the Fourth Book, 219	Books Received, 121-124; 245-248; 374-377; 497-500
Aeschylus' Agamemnon, Notes on 96	Brief Mention, 105-116; 227-241; 358-369; 485-492
Aetna, 244, 481	Caesar's Bellum Civile, unrevised, 96
Albius and Tibullus, 450-460	CAPPS, EDWARD. <i>Παραλονθαται</i> in Aristophanes' <i>Anagyrus</i> Fr. 55 K., 72-82
Alkman, The Parthenelon of, 57-67	Carneades and his Degrees of Probability, 97
Alpha and Omega, 482	Cassianus' Consolatio, 348
Anthologia Latina, Fifteenth Century Authors in, 96	Cat and Candle, Story of, 354-356
Anthology Greek, Notes on 227	Catalepton, 317-323
Antony, Campaign of Epigram Against, 317-322	Cauer's <i>Grammatica Militans</i> (mentioned), 488
Apollonius Rhodius and Cyzicus, 43-56	Causal Sentences in Greek, 46
Aristarchus, Defence of, 98, 482	Centaur in Ancient Art, 465-467
Aristophanes, <i>Anagyrus</i> Fr. 55 K., 72-82	Cézard's <i>Métrique Sacrée</i> (mentioned), 233
Herakles in the Frogs of, 97	C. I. A., 1, 59, Hicks 56, 348
Aristotelian Divisions, A New MS. of, 218	Cicero ad Att. II 17, 2, 351
Aristotle's 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία, 98	Ciris Question, 347
Katharsis, 229	Columbia Lectures on Greek Literature, 487
Probl. <i>Physica</i> iv, 13; p. 878 a 14-15 (emended) 218	Cook's Concordance to Beowulf (rev.), 86-87
Arnold's Roman Stoicism (rev.) 205-209	Corinna, Dialect of, 475
Articular Infinitive, Sphere of, 107	Cory's Heraclitus, 486
Asia Minor Sepulchral Inscriptions, 349	Cyzicus, Apollonius Rhodius and, 43-56
Asinius Pollio, 483	Daniel the Prophet's Oneirocriticon, 103
Attic Treasure-lists, 96	Dative (Latin) with Prepositional Compounds, 285-300
Baur's Centaurs in Ancient Art (rev.), 465-467	
Bellermann's <i>Aias</i> (mentioned), 228	
Belzner's Homerische Probleme (rev.), 209-212	
Bennett's Early Latin Syntax (mentioned), 110	
Beowulf, Cook's Concordance to (noticed), 86-87	

DE WITT, NORMAN W. A Campaign of Epigram Against M. Antonius in the Catalepton, 317-323

Donatist Epigraphy, 103

Doric Pederasty, 481

Dragoumis, Tales of a Greek Island (rev.), 363-365

EBELING, H. L. Report of Hermes, 346-351

EDGERTON, FRANKLIN. A Hindu Book of Tales: The Vi-kramacarita, 249-284

Report of Glotta, 221-226; 473-483

Egyptian Inscriptions, 102

ELLIOTT, A. M. His services, 353

ELMORE, J. On Juvenal Sat. I. 144, 203-204

EMBER, AARON. Notice of Spivak's Yiddish Dictionary, 214-215

Epigram, Campaign of, 317-323

Epigram and Sonnet, 111-112

Etruscan ci = quinque, dossenus, maccus, persona, 478

Etymologies, Modern Greek, 479

See also E. W. FAY.

Eunomius as Tachygrapher, 218

Euripides, Troad. 566 99

FAY, EDWIN W. Lucilius on i and ei, 311-316

Derivatives of the Root *stha* in Composition, 377-400

FITCH, EDWARD. Apollonius Rhodius and Cyzicus, 43-56

FOSTER, B. O. Review of Hosius' and Phillimore's Propertius, 330-342

FOX, W. SHERWOOD. The Johns Hopkins Tabellae Defixio-num (Supplement), 1-68

Submerged Tabellae Defixio-num, 301-310

French Scholars, Unpublished Letters of, 217

French U Not Due to Celtic Influence, 353

Frischlin's Julius Redivivus, 231

Hypotaxis and Parataxis, 489

GARNETT, JAMES M. Review of Cook's Concordance to Beowulf, 86-87

Review of Oxford English Dictionary, 82-86

Gellius, N. A. xvii 21, 98

GILDERSLEEVE, BASIL L. Notice of Spratt's Thucydides, Book iv, 212-213

Review of Nilsson's Causal-sätze, 468-471

Usque Recurret M̄, 447-449

See Brief Mention.

Glotta, Report of, 221-226; 473-480

GOODELL, THOMAS D. Imagination and Will in MH, 436-446

GOODWIN, W. W. Death of, 307-308

Greek, Modern, Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion (rev.), 87-90

'Brother' in, 476

Causal Sentences in, 468-471

Genitive, 488

Literature, Triads of, 106, 487

Modern Etymologies, 479

'Poetical' Plural in, 223

Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction, 358-359

Greek: ἀλλᾶς, 226; βαίνω, 475; γυμνός and nudus, 324-326; δασφέρειν c. gen., 475; ἔαν and εἰ, 490; εἰς, 99; ἄκτα, οὐτα, ἀπήρα, ἐγήρα, 222; εἰσπνήλας, 482; εινῆμαρ, 473; ἐπιγλωττίς, 474; ἡμιν and ιμιν, quantity of, 224; -εν, κατάρχεσθαι and ἐνάρχεσθαι, 348; λελιχμότες, 97; λῆν, 477; λναιτελεῖν, 482; μένος, 473; μή, 426-439; νεκύσια, 351; ὄδιναι, 473; ὄρθογράφος = 'litterator', 97; ὄξυρυχος-writing, 100; παύσισκος, 477, 479; παραλονθεῖται, 78-82; πεφυζότες, 96; πός not from προτί, πός and ποτί independent forms, 222; πον, 240; proper names in -κορ, 222; δόνιξι, Egypt. = 'boat', 475; Σιλανός, 480; τινός like ἐνός, 222; τοι, 240; -σαι middle ending, 222; ιδάτη, 482; χρισδον περιχειεν, 348; ὥρατα, 351.

HAMILTON, GEORGE L. Review of Lawson's Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion, 87-90

Notice of Traube's Vorlesungen u. Abhandlungen, 471-2

HARMON, A. M. Protesilaus-damia Laevil, 186-194

Harper's Babylonian Letters (rev.), 342-345

HEIDEL, W. A. Brief Mention of Pascal's *Epicurei e Misticis*, 115

Review of Adam's *Vitality of Platonism*, 91-95

Review of Arnold's *Roman Stoicism*, 205-209

Hellenica Oxyrhynchia, 348

Heracliti *Quaestiones Homericae* (mentioned), 114

Hermes, Report of, 346-351

Herodotus V 48, 481

Hexameter, Schiller's Model, 228

Hindu Book of Tales, 249-284

Historical Infinitive in Latin, 478

Homeric Metre, 401-425

Homeric Problems, 209-212

Horace and Tibullus, 149-167

Horace Od. I 3, 9, 487

Roman Odes, 484

Hosius' Propertius (rev.), 330-336

Hoskier's *Genesis of the Versions*, 30-42

Iliad 5, 842, 481

Phoenix in the, 68-77

Indo-European Consonant System, Phonetic Tendencies in, 195-202

Inscriptions, Sepulchral, of Asia Minor, 349

Ionians and Achaeans, 291

Ionic Sophistic Questioned, 483

Ionic Verb Forms in Attic, 479

Isocrates' Cyprian Orations, ed. Forster (mentioned), 235

Traces of Sophistic in, 480

IS. Unpublished, 100

Concerning Kleobis and Biton, 484

Juvenal Sat. I 7 ff., 346

144, 203-204

JOHNSTON, CHRISTOPHER. Review of Harper's Assyrian and Babylonian Letters, 342-345

KEIDEL, GEORGE C. Report of Romania, 352-357

KELLOGG, GEORGE DWIGHT. Report of Philologus, 480-484

KNAPP, CHARLES. The Sceptical Assault on the Roman Tradition Concerning the Dramatic Satura, 125-146

Kukula's Römische Säkularpoesie (rev.), 461-465

Laevius and his Protesilaudamia, 186-194

Latin Inscriptions at the Johns Hopkins University, 168-185

Latin Inscriptions of Spain, 354

Latin, The Dative with Prepositional Compounds, 285-300

Dative, Syntax of, 476

Historical Inf. in, 478

Latin: alid, 475; amuletum, 477; armentum, 226; de, ex, 474; dignus, 476; dum, dummodo, modo, Syntax of, 224; est = edit, 223; γνωνός and nudus, 324-325; i and ei, 311-316; ille and iste have two stems, 225; melca, 473; nubo, 226; formitare, 475; incolumis, 477; nuncupare, 478; odium and its kin, 477; praesto, 480; plorare = πλάγοσειν, 100; rigere, 478.

Lawson's Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion (rev), 87-90

LEASE, EMORY B. Dative with Prepositional Compounds, Lietzmann Collection (mentioned), 115

Longinus (Ps.) περὶ ὕψους II 2; VII 1, 349

Lucilius on i and ei, 311-316

Magic in the Fourth Book of the Aeneid, 219

Marcus Aurel. 10, 15 (em.), 351

Martial's Epigrams, 350

Marzabotto, Stone Weights of, 347

Maurice's Numismatique Constantinienne (mentioned), 116

Mercury Amalgam Process, 348

Metre, Homeric, 401-425

MILLER, C. W. E. Notice of Schubart's *Papyri Graecae Berolinenses*, 368-369

Notice of Ceretelli and Sobolevski, Minuscule MSS, 402

Report of *Revue de Philologie*, 100-104; 216-220

Musicians, Longevity of, 240

MUSTARD, WILFRED P. Report of *Rheinisches Museum*, 96-100

Review of Kukula's Römische Säkularpoesie, 461-465

Necrology:  
 Elliott, A. M. 383  
 Goodwin, W. W. 367-368  
 Vahlen, Johannes, 367  
 Nilsson's *Causalsätze* (rev.), 469-471

Odyssey, Culture in the, 209-212  
 Oscar, Accent in, 224  
 Graffiti, 223  
 Otte on Aristotle's *Katharsis*, 229  
 Ovid as a Source of French  
 Romances, 353  
 And His Borrowings, 483  
 Oxford Dictionary. Concise  
 (mentioned), 241  
 Oxford English Dictionary  
 (rev.), 82-86  
 Oxyrhynchia, Hellenica, 348  
 Not by Theopompos but  
 Ephorus, 96

Papyrus, Roman Control of, 481  
 Parataxis and Hypotaxis, 489  
 Participle, Latin, Antiquity of, 110  
 Pascal's *Epileurei e Mistici*  
 (mentioned), 115

PEARSON, A. C. On the Use of  
*ōrav*, with causal implication, 426-435  
 Pederasty, Doric, 481-482  
 Pentameter, to the vi century  
 a verse of five feet, 97  
 Persius, ed. Van Wageningen  
 (mentioned), 236  
 Petronius, Emendations in, 99  
 Phaedrus, 346  
 Philip and the Roman Institutions, 217  
 Phillimore's *Propertius* (rev.), 336-342  
 Philologus, Report of, 480-484  
 Philumenos MS., 346  
 Phonetic Tendencies in Indo-European Consonant System, 195-202  
 Pilum, Iberian Origin of the, 99  
 Pindar O. 2, 57-60, 351  
 Second Pythian, 400  
 Theognis and, 106  
 Plato, Ep. vi, 98  
 Symp. 176 B., 349  
 Platonism, Vitality of, 91-95  
 Pliny N. H. vii. 2. 8, 220  
 Poetical Plural in Greek, 223  
 Poros, the Island, 363-367  
 POSTGATE, J. P. Albius and  
 Tibullus, 450-455

Prepositional Compounds, Dative with, 285-300  
 PROKOSCH, E. Phonetic Tendencies in the Indo-European Consonant System, 195-202  
 Protesilaudamia Laevii, 186-194  
 Ptolemaeus *Harmonica* II 10  
 (em.), 348  
 Pythagorean Letter, Earliest  
 Evidence for, 99

Quantities, False, Traditional, 113

Reading Aloud, 99  
 Recent Publications, 117-120;  
 242-244; 370-373; 493-496

Remus and Romulus, 225

Reports:  
 Glotta, 221-226; 473-480  
 Hermes, 346-351  
 Philologus, 480-484  
 Revue de Philologie, 100-104; 216-220  
 Rheinisches Museum für  
 Philologie, 96-100  
 Romania, 352-357

Reviews:  
 Adam's Vitality of Platonism  
 and Other Essays, 91-95  
 Arnold's Roman Stoicism, 204-209  
 Baur's Centaurs in Ancient Art, 465-467  
 Bellermann's Sophocles' *Alas*, 228  
 Belzner's Homerische Probleme, 209-212  
 Bennett's Early Latin, 110  
 Cauer's *Grammatica Militans*, 488  
 Ceretelli and Sobolevski's Minuscule MSS., 492  
 Cézard's Métrique Sacree des  
 Grecs et des Romains, 233  
 Cook's Concordance to Beowulf, 86-87  
 Dragoumis' Tales of a Greek  
 Island, 363 ff.  
 Forster's Isocrates' Cyprian  
 Orations, 235  
 Harper's Babylonian Letters, 342-345  
 Hösli's *Propertius*, 330-336  
 Kukula's Römische Säkularpoesie, 461-465  
 Lawson's Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion, 87-90  
 Maurice, Numismatique Constantinienne, 116  
 Nilsson's *Causalsätze*, 468-471

Otte on Aristotle's *Katharsis*, 229  
 Oxford English Dictionary, 83-86  
 Pascal's *Epicurei e Mistici*, 115  
 Phillipore's *Propertius*, 336-342  
 Schubart's *Papyri Graecae Berolinenses*, 369  
 Spratt's *Thucydides Book iv*, 212-214  
 Spivak's *Yiddish Dictionary*, 214-215  
 Traube's *Vorlesungen u. Abhandlungen*, 471-472  
 Van Wageningen's *Persius*, 236  
 Willamowitz, Mimnermos and *Propertius*, 361-362  
 Williams' *Aristoxenian Theory*, 232  
 Willis's Maruchi's Christian Epigraphy, 412  
 Wolff's Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction, 348-359  
*Revue de Philologie*, Report of, 100-104; 216-220  
*Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, Report of, 96-100  
 ROBINSON, DAVID M. Review of Baur's *Centaurs in Ancient Art*, 465-468  
 Roman 'Secular' Poetry, 461-465  
 Roman Stoicism, 205-209  
 Romania, Report of, 352-357  
 Romulus-Phaedrus, 346  
 Romulus, Remus and, 225  
 Rostand's *Chantecler*, Heads for Study of, 207  
 Rutilius Namatianus, not Necessarily a Pagan, 98  
 St. Paul, I Cor. 13, 1, 481  
 SANDERS, HENRY A. Hoskier's *Genesis of the Versions of the New Testament*, 30-42  
 Sanskrit, Instability of Moods in Earliest, 1-29  
 Satura, The Dramatic, 125-148  
 Schubart's *Papyri Graecae Berolinenses* (rev.), 369  
 SCOTT, JOHN A. *Phoenix in the Iliad*, 68-77  
 Review of Belzner's *Homerische Probleme*, 209-213  
 Seneca's *Voyage to Egypt*, Date of, 216  
 Septuagint Papyri, 220  
 Servius Question, 481  
 Shorey on Greek Literature, 487  
 Sophocles' *I<sub>λ</sub>γ<sub>ν</sub>ε<sub>ρ</sub>ταί*, 485  
 Spain, Latin Inscriptions of, 354  
 Spivak's *Yiddish Dictionary* (notice), 214-215  
 Spratt's *Thucydides*, Book iv (rev.), 212-214  
 Stobaeus *Flor.* 118. 3 and Shakespeare, 115  
 Stoicism, Roman, Arnold's, 204-209  
 Stone Weights of Marzabotto, 347  
 STURTEVANT, E. H. *Γυμνός* and *Nudus*, 324-326  
 Submerged Tabellae Defixio- num, 301-310  
 Syntactical Tests, 112  
 Syntax, Eidographic and Stylistic Conventionalities, 108  
 Tabellae Defixionum, Johns Hopkins.  
 See *Supplement*.  
 Submerged, 301-310  
 Theodoretus' Ecclesiastical History, A New MS. of, 219  
 Theognis and Pindar, 106  
 Theognis (Ps.) and the Old Comedy, 484  
 Theognidean Syntax, 107  
 Theramenes in Ar. *Ranae*, 534, 97  
 Thucydides Book viii, 352  
 the Thracian, 237-239  
 Tiberius, Official Accession of, 101  
 Tibullus, Horace and, 149-167  
 Albius and, 450-460  
 Translation, 485  
 Traube's *Vorlesungen u. Abhandlungen*, 471-472  
 ULLMAN, B. L. Horace and Tibullus, 149-167  
 Rejoinder to Mr. Postgate, 456-460  
 Umbrian pone = pollinem, 224  
 Vahlen, Death of, 367  
 Van Wageningen's *Persius* (mentioned), 236  
 Verbs Simple for Compound in Vulgar Greek and Latin, 495  
 Vergil, *Aeneid*, Magic in the Fourth Book of, 219  
*Aeneid* II, 402, 481  
 Vergilian Notes, 97  
 Versions of the New Testament, 30-42  
 Vikramacarita, The, 249-284  
 Villoison, Three Unpublished Letters of, 101  
 Wernicke's Law, 223-224

Wilamowitz's <i>Mimnermos</i> and Propertius, 361-362	WILSON, WINIFRED WARREN.
Williams' Aristoxenian Theory of Musical Rhythm, 232	The Parthenon of Alk- man, 57-67
WILSON, HARRY LANGFORD. Latin Inscriptions at the Johns Hopkins University, 168-185	Wolf's Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction (mentioned), 358-359
Notice of Maurice, <i>Numisma- tique Constantinienne</i> , 116	Writing Parallel to the Shorter Side, 97
Notice of Willis's Marucchi's Christian Epigraphy, 402	Xenophon MSS, 347
	Yiddish Dictionary, Spivak's (rev.) 214-215

**Messrs. LEMCKE & BUECHNER**  
**30-32 WEST 27th STREET**  
**NEW YORK**

have pleasure in announcing the imminent publication of: *Epitome Thesauri Latini, ed. F. Vollmer*, in 40 parts of 5 sheets, at 50 cts., net, each part, or 4 volumes, 4°.

Subscriptions placed with them before January 1, 1913, will be accepted at a discount of 25 per cent., or 37½ cts., net, each part. The Subscription is binding for the complete work. Part 1 now ready, part 2 to appear later in the year, and thereafter the parts will follow in quick succession in the wake of the great "Thesaurus".

The book is in the best style of the Teubner press, in clear type, on paper free from wood-pulp.

*Passow's Woerterbuch der griechischen Sprache* völlig neu bearbeitet von Wilhelm Crönert, in about 50 parts, quarto, at 70 cts. per part, if ordered before the appearance of part 3; after that 80 cts. per part. Part 1 now ready, part 2 expected shortly.

---

**JUST PUBLISHED :**

*Greek Literature*, a series of Lectures delivered at Columbia University. The contributors are: P. Shorey, H. W. Smyth, E. D. Perry, J. R. Wheeler, E. Capps, B. Perrin, Ch. F. Smith, F. J. E. Woodbridge, H. W. Prescott, G. Lodge. 8°, cloth, pp. VII, 306. \$2.00 net.

*The Classical Papers of Mortimer Lamson Earle*, with a memoir. 8°, cloth, portrait and plates, pp. XXX, 300. \$3.00 net.

*The Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction*, by S. L. Wolff. 12mo, cloth, pp. VII, 529. \$2.00 net.

---

Published by the

**Columbia University Press**  
NEW YORK

**Lemcke & Buechner, Agents**



# The Lord Baltimore Press

FORMERLY THE FRIEDENWALD CO.

Printers

Lithographers

Book Binders

Greenmount Avenue and Oliver Street  
BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

---

Printers of the American Journal of Philology, American Journal of Mathematics,  
Memoirs from the Biological Laboratory, and other Works  
Issued by the Johns Hopkins University.

---

HIGHEST STANDARD OF WORK

LOWEST PRICES FOR THE STANDARD

## RECENTLY ISSUED

**Harvard Studies in Classical Philology**

VOLUME XXIII

8vo 176 pages \$1.50

---

A list of the articles published in this and preceding volumes of the series will be sent postpaid to any address on request

---

Published by

**HARVARD UNIVERSITY**  
**CAMBRIDGE, MASS.**

---

**GILDERSLEEVE'S SYNTAX OF CLASSICAL GREEK, FROM HOMER TO DEMOSTHENES**

**FIRST PART**—The syntax of the simple sentence, embracing the doctrine of the moods and tenses.

**SECOND PART**—The syntax of the simple sentence continued, embracing the doctrine of the article.

Price, \$1.50 each

THE first two parts of a work which, when completed, will form by far the most comprehensive and scholarly exposition of Greek syntax ever published. A unique feature of the work is the collection of examples, which are truly representative of all the departments of Greek literature. These various departments are presented in the order of their development, and the authors in each period are cited in chronological order, thus forming not only a syntax of style, but an historical syntax as well. Taking the Attic orators as the standard of conventional Greek, Dr. Gildersleeve has worked backward through philosophy and history, to tragic, lyric, and epic poetry, comedy being the bridge which spans the syntax of the agora and the syntax of Parnassus. In the presentation, ease of consultation has everywhere been aimed at, and, consequently, only a single topic has been treated in each section.

---

**AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY**  
NEW YORK      CINCINNATI      CHICAGO

## The Eclogues of Baptista Mantuanus, edited

with Introduction and Notes by WILFRED P. MUSTARD, Ph. D.,  
Collegiate Professor of Latin in the Johns Hopkins University.  
Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1911. 156 Pages. 8vo.  
Price \$1.50.

The Text is based upon that of the first printed edition, of Mantua, 1498. The Introduction treats of the life of Mantuan, his family and friends, his popularity, the wide use of his Eclogues as a school book, and their influence upon Sixteenth Century literature. The Notes are mainly devoted to the poet's use of his great classical models.

### Extracts from Early Reviews

"An able and instructive edition."—*Scotsman*.

"A very learned and careful edition."—*Spectator*.

"A most curious, interesting, and scholarly volume."—*Educational Times*.

"A full and minutely accurate introduction."—*Modern Language Notes*.

"Bien des auteurs anciens n'ont pas eu tant d'honneur."—*Revue de Philologie*.

"We welcome a new edition of Mantuan after many years, and are grateful to the learned editor for providing us with one so satisfactory."—*Nation*.

"In Summa: Mustards Buch ist eine tüchtige Arbeit, die den Wunsch nach ähnlichen Leistungen des Verf. auf diesem Gebiete rege werden lässt."—*Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*.

"Ohne Zweifel wird das Buch der humanistischen Dichtung neue Freunde gewinnen und Ref. wünscht aufrichtig, weiteren ähnlichen Darbietungen des Verfassers zu begegnen."—*Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie*.

"Le texte est suivi d' un commentaire abondant qui complète l' introduction déjà très nourrie. La masse de renseignements accumulés dans ce petit volume est considérable et témoigne de recherches approfondies."—*Revue Critique*.

"Niet minder prijzenswaardig is zijn onderzoek, in hoeverre de Engelsche poëzie aan Mantuanus stof en uitspraken heeft ontleend en met hem hopen wij dat door anderen dit werk zal gedaan worden voor de litteraturen der andere talen."—*Museum*.

"Dall' America ci giunge una edizioncella che avremmo dovuto far noi. . . . Il prof. Mustard ha assolto questo impegno egregiamente; il suo libretto è nitido ed elegante nell' elaborazione interna non meno che nell' assetto esteriore. . . . La dimostrazione di ciò risulta dall' originale e ben fatto commento, che fa veramente onore al filologo latinista."—*Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana*.

Copies may be procured from Messrs. Parker & Son, 27 Broad Street, Oxford (at 6s. 6d. net), or directly from the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

VOL. XXXIII, 4

WHOLE NO. 132

THE

AMERICAN

# JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY

BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE

FRANCIS WHITE PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

BALTIMORE: THE EDITOR

LONDON: KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & CO.

PARIS: ALBERT FONTENOING LEIPSIC: F. A. BROCKHAUS

OCTOBER, NOVEMBER, DECEMBER

1912

Entered as second-class matter October 16, 1911, at the postoffice at Baltimore, Maryland, under the  
Act of March 3, 1879.

GENERAL LIBRARY  
JAN - 6 1913  
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

## CONTENTS.

I.—Derivatives of the Root <i>STHA</i> in Composition. By EDWIN W. FAY, . . . . .	377
II.—Contributions to the Study of Homeric Metre. By GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING, . . . . .	401
III.—On the Use of <i>διαν</i> with Causal Implication. By A. C. PEARSON. 426	
IV.—Imagination and Will in MH. By THOMAS D. GOODELL, . . . . .	436
V.— <i>Uique Recurret</i> MH. By BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE, . . . . .	447
VI.—Albius and Tibullus. By J. P. Postgate, . . . . .	450
VII.—Rejoinder to Mr. Postgate. By B. L. ULLMAN, . . . . .	456
<b>REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES:</b> . . . . .	461
Kukula's <i>Römische Säkularposie</i> .—Baur's <i>Centauri in Ancient Art</i> .—Nilsson's <i>Die Causalsätze im Griechischen bis Aristoteles</i> .—Traube's <i>Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen</i> .	
<b>REPORTS:</b> . . . . .	473
Glotta.— <i>Philologus</i> , . . . . .	
<b>BRIEF MENTION,</b> . . . . .	485
<b>RECENT PUBLICATIONS,</b> . . . . .	493
<b>BOOKS RECEIVED,</b> . . . . .	497
<b>INDEX,</b> . . . . .	501

Open to original communications in all departments of philology, classical, comparative, oriental, modern; condensed reports of current philological work; summaries of chief articles in the leading philological journals of Europe; reviews by specialists, bibliographical lists. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price \$3.00 a year (foreign postage 50 cents), payable to the publisher in advance; single numbers, \$1.00 each. Suitable advertisements will be inserted at the following rates:

	1 TIME.	2 T.	3 T.	4 T.
One page . . . . .	\$16 00	\$30 00	\$40 00	\$50 00
Half page . . . . .	8 00	15 00	20 00	25 00
Quarter page . . . . .	4 00	8 00	12 00	15 00
Eighth page. . . . .	2 00	4 00	6 00	8 00

The English Agents of the American Journal of Philology are Messrs. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Paternoster House, Charing Cross Road, London, W. C.

**SPECIAL NOTICE.**—The stock of complete sets of THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY has passed over into the hands of the undersigned. These sets will be sold for the present at the reduced price of \$67, for the thirty-three volumes, cash to accompany the order. Single volumes, \$3 (foreign postage, 50 cents); single numbers, \$1 each, so far as they can be supplied. Address,

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore, Md.

Published quarterly. Three dollars a year (foreign postage, 50 cents).

The Johns Hopkins Press

BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

